SITE REVIEW SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Date: Tuesday, February 12, 2019
Time: 3:30 pm
Meeting Location: 905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

The limited purposes of this session are:
(1) To visit the site of a project listed on the agenda
(2) To allow staff to provide an overview and to respond to Board Members’ inquiries regarding factual aspects of this item on the upcoming regular meeting agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Regular Agenda Item No. 8.b
   a. Address: 905 Lighthouse Avenue (APN 006-342-003)
      Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957
      Description: The project consists of the demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sf addition to an existing 1926 Craftsman style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sf ADU above. The project complies with the development standards of the R-4 zoning district.
      Zone District/General Plan Designation: R-4 / Residential High Density (29 du/ac)
      Coastal Zone: No Archaeological Zone: No Historic Resources Inventory: No Area of Special Biological Significance: Yes
      CEQA Status: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(l) (Residential Demolition) and 15303(a) (New Construction)
      Applicant/Owner: MBA Architects, on behalf of Richard Gallagher, owner
      Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

3. Adjourn to City Hall for Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board

This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are welcome to attend. Transportation to the location of the site visit will not be provided by the City of Pacific Grove. The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities, and meetings are held in accessible facilities.
Regular Meeting Agenda begins on next page.

Regular Meeting will begin at 4 p.m. at Council Chamber
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
4:00 p.m., February 12, 2019
Council Chambers – City Hall – 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA
Copies of the agenda packet, and materials related to an item on the agenda submitted after distribution of the agenda packet, are available for review at the Pacific Grove Library located at 550 Central Avenue and the CEDD counter in City Hall at 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove from 8 a.m. – 12 p.m. and 1 p.m. – 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday; and on the internet at www.cityofpacificgrove.org/arb

1. Call to Order – 4:00 pm

2. Roll Call
Architectural Review Board Members: Sarah Boyle, Jeff Edmonds, Michael Gunby, Terrence Coen, Jen Veitengruber, Garrett Van Zantan

3. Election of Officers: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

4. Approval of Agenda

5. Approval of Minutes
   a. Approval of January 8, 2019 Minutes
      Recommended Action: Approve as presented

6. Public Comments
   a. Written Communications
      Communications relevant to ARB jurisdiction, but not related to a matter on this agenda, are attached under this agenda item.

   b. Oral Communications
      Comments from the audience will not receive ARB action. Comments must deal with matters subject to the jurisdiction of the ARB and will be limited to three minutes. Comments regarding agenda items shall be heard at the time such items are called. Whenever possible, letters should be submitted to the ARB in advance of the meeting.

7. Reports of Council Liaison

8. Consent Agenda
   a. Address: 642 Hillcrest Avenue (APN 006-652-015)
      Application #: Use Permit (UP) / Admin. Architectural Permit (AAP) 18-0993
      Description: A recommendation from the ARB to the Planning Commission is needed for exterior and interior alterations to, as well as for a change in use of, an existing detached accessory building in excess of 120 sq. ft. in size. No changes to the existing building are proposed at this time. This review will assist in legitimizing alterations that have occurred in the recent past without the benefit of review.
Zone District/General Plan Designation: Residential Single-Family (R-1) / Residential Medium Density (up to 17.4 dwelling units/area)
Coastal Zone: No  Historic Resources Inventory: No  Area of Special Biological Significance: Yes
CEQA Status: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301(a) (Exterior Alterations)
Applicant/Owner: Thomas Howe (owner)
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

9. Regular Agenda
Members of the public are welcome to offer their comments on any of the following items after being recognized by the Chair. Presentations will be limited to three minutes, or as otherwise established by the Commission Chair. Persons are not required to give their name or address, but it is helpful for speakers to state their name in order that they are identified in the minutes.

a. Address: 246 Forest Avenue (APN 006-281-008)
Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0733
Description: The proposed project is for the development of two, two-bedroom residential units above the Mum’s Place commercial building located at 246 Forest Avenue. The two units will total ± 2,783 sq. ft. and will be located at the rear one-third of the building overlooking 16th Street. One onsite parking space will be provided in the existing garage. Additional access improvements on the 16th Street side are included as is the return of an infill window on the Forest Ave. façade to match the other existing windows. Although this building is not on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory, it is considered a historic resource given its age and remaining original architectural features. A Phase II Historic Assessment was prepared by a qualified historian which indicates that the project will retain the building’s existing character-defining features and will be undertaken in substantial conformance to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
Zone District/General Plan Designation: Downtown Commercial (C-D) / Commercial (20-30 du/ac)
Coastal Zone: No  Historic Resources Inventory: No  Area of Special Biological Significance: Yes
CEQA Status: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15331 (Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) and 15301(e) (Additions)
Applicant/Owner: Jeanne Byrne, FAIA / Mugo & Talin Tersakyan
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

b. Address: 945 Jewell Avenue (APN 006-131-005)
Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0946
Project Description: An 808 sq. ft. addition to the rear of an existing 1,080 sq. ft. single-story residence. The ± 11,740 sq. ft. parcel is developed with a detached one-car garage, a small shed, and several trees, all of which will remain. All development standards of the R-1 zoning district will be met. No tree removal is proposed.
Zone District/Land Use: R-1 / Medium Density to 17.4 du/ac
Coastal Zone: No  Archaeological Zone: Yes  Historic Resources Inventory: No  Area of Special Biological Significance: Yes
CEQA Status: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(e) (Additions) and 15331 (Historical Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation)
Applicant/Owner: Aaron Tollefson, on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Ratto, owners
Staff Reference: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org
c. **Address:** 909 Egan Avenue (APN 006-092-009)  
**Application #:** Architectural Permit (AP) / Tree Permit (TP-D) 18-0896  
**Description:** The project consists of a residential remodel including the demolition of a portion of the rear of the existing two-story house, a 176 sq. ft. attached replacement structure, and a new second-story deck of 77 sq. ft. on the northwest corner of the house to match the existing second-story deck on the northeast corner. The project includes removal of one (1) 19” diameter non-native holly tree which is regulated by Title 12 of the PGMC. The project meets all of the development standards of the R-1 zoning district.  
**Zone District/General Plan Designation:** R-1 / Res. Medium Density (17.4 du/acre)  
**Coastal Zone:** No  
**Archaeological Zone:** Yes  
**Historic Resources Inventory:** No  
**Area of Special Biological Significance:** Yes  
**CEQA Status:** Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e) (Additions)  
**Applicant/Owner:** Fletcher+Hardoin, on behalf of Paul & Debbie Baker, owner(s)  
**Staff Reference:** Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

---

**d. Address:** 905 Lighthouse Avenue (APN 006-342-003)  
This item was continued from the January 8, 2019, ARB meeting.  
**Application #:** Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957  
**Description:** The project consists of the demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sf addition to an existing 1926 Craftsman style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sf ADU above. The project complies with the development standards of the R-4 zoning district.  
**Zone District/General Plan Designation:** R-4 / Residential High Density (29 du/ac)  
**Coastal Zone:** No  
**Archaeological Zone:** No  
**Historic Resources Inventory:** No  
**Area of Special Biological Significance:** Yes  
**CEQA Status:** Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(l) (Residential Demolition) and 15303(a) (New Construction)  
**Applicant/Owner:** MBA Architects, on behalf of Richard Gallagher, owner  
**Staff Reference:** Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

---

10. Reports of ARB Members

11. Staff Update

12. Adjournment

---

The City of Pacific Grove does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. City Hall is an accessible facility. A limited number of devices are available to assist those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

---

**GENERAL NOTICE**

- Please note that Section 65009(b)(2) of the California Government Code provides that legal challenges to the City's action on a project may be limited to only those issues raised in testimony during the public hearing process.

**NOTICE TO APPLICANTS**

- **Appearance by Applicant/Representative:** Applicants or their representatives must be present at the meeting for which their item, including those items on the Consent Agenda, is scheduled. If unable to attend, the applicant must submit a written request for continuance prior to the meeting. The item may be denied if continuance is not requested.

- **Appeals and Appeal Period:** Decisions rendered may be appealed using a form available at the CDD. The appeal form, plus an appeal fee, must be filed with the CDD within 10 days of the action.

- **Judicial Time Limits:** This serves as written notice that Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC) §1.20.010 incorporates §1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California and provides a ninety-day limitation for judicial review of any final administrative decision by the council, or any board, commissioner, or officer of the city.
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TO: Members of the Architecture Review Board

FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner

MEETING DATE: February 12, 2019

SUBJECT: Election of Officers

CEQA: Does not constitute a “Project” as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends the Architecture Review Board elect a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary for a one-year term in accordance with the Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC) § 3.02.050(b), Members – Terms.

BACKGROUND
In accordance with PGMC § 3.02.050(b), election of a Chairperson, Vice-Chair, and Secretary shall occur at the first Architecture Review Board (ARB) meeting in February. The first ARB meeting is February 12, 2019, so it is appropriate to perform this function.

The Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary can serve more than one term and there is no right of succession to be Chair, Vice-Chair, or Secretary. Procedurally, the current Chair, or if there is no Chair, the member who called the meeting to order, takes the lead on this action by first requesting nomination of Chair from other members. Any member may nominate himself/herself or any other member of the board; no second is required. Once nominations are complete, the current Chair will close nominations, announce the slate of nominees, and ask for a vote on the nominees in the order of nomination. The nominee receiving votes from a majority of the members in attendance shall be declared the newly elected Chair. If no member receives the majority, the process shall be repeated, except in the event of a tie, in which case a run-off shall be held.

The same procedure is followed for the Vice-Chair and Secretary position. The term of the new Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary shall begin immediately.

Responsibilities
In accordance with the Board and Commission Member Handbook, Standard Protocol, the responsibilities and powers of board officers shall be as follows:
Chair
- In consultation with staff, determine the agenda.
- Call special meetings of the board.
- Preside at all meetings.
- Fully participate in the board’s deliberations.
- See that all actions of the board are properly taken.
- Act as parliamentarian, applying and enforcing these protocols and parliamentary procedures.
- Sign all documents of the board.
- Report to the Council, at scheduled times and as needed, on matters of interest.

As a member of the body, the Chair has full rights to participate in dialogue and decision making, and to make and second motions. The Chair often strives to be the last to speak during any round, and generally does not make or second a motion unless he or she is convinced that no other member of the body will do so.

Vice Chair
During the absence, disability, or disqualification of the Chair, the Vice-Chair shall exercise or perform all the duties and be subject to all responsibilities of the Chair.

Secretary
- Repeat motions prior to a vote, if requested by Chair.
- Prepare and attest to approved action minutes.

Attendance
Please note the importance of attendance and participation in order to serve the public and conduct City business. Therefore, the Board and Commission Member Handbook indicates that absences for more than 25% of meetings within a 12-month period, or 3 consecutive absences, may result in removal of a member. Attendance is necessary to pass a motion: pursuant to the PGMC § 3.04.080, "An affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed members of the board, committee, or commission shall be required for any action by the board, committee, or commission.” For example, if there are 6 appointed members, and only 4 members are present, the motion still requires 4 votes of approval in order to pass the motion. Please kindly notify staff in advance if unable to attend a meeting.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Alyson Hunter
Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
1. Call to Order – 4:00 pm

2. Roll Call
   Architectural Review Board Members Present: Sarah Boyle, Chair, Jeff Edmonds, Vice-Chair
   Michael Gunby, Terrence Coen, Jen Veitengruber, one vacancy

   Members Absent: Tom Lane, Secretary

3. Approval of Agenda

   On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Vice-Chair Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0-1-0
   (Member Lane absent) to approve the Agenda subject to continuance of Item 7b to the February
   12th meeting.

   Motion passed.

4. Approval of Minutes
   a. November 27, 2018

   On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Vice-Chair Edmonds, the Board voted 5-0-1-0
   (Member Lane absent) to approve the minutes from the November 27th meeting.

   Motion passed.

5. Public Comments
   a. Written Communications
      None

   b. Oral Communications
      None

6. Consent Agenda

   None.

7. Regular Agenda

   a. Address: 1246 Del Monte Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-015-012)
      Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) / Admin. Use Permit (AUP) 18-0945
**Description:** The project consists of the interior and exterior remodel of an existing one-story ranch-style residence to add an approx. 433 sq. ft. second-story addition with an approx. 160 sq. ft. covered second-story deck on the north side. The project includes the conversion of an existing two-car garage to a one-car garage, the realignment of the driveway and an AUP to allow the chimney to exceed the 25’ maximum height limit.

**Zone District/General Plan Designation:** R-1-H / Res. Medium Density (up to 17.4 du/acre)

**Coastal Zone:** No  
**Archaeological Zone:** Yes  
**Historic Resources Inventory:** No  
**Area of Special Biological Significance:** Yes

**CEQA Status:** Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1), *Minor Additions*

**Applicant/Owner:** Homelife Design Studio, on behalf of Paul & Jennifer Silverglate, owner(s)

**Staff Reference:** Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner, provided the Staff Report.

Joshua Stewman, the designer for the project, answered Board Member’s questions.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment.

The Chair closed the floor to public comment.

The Board discussed the project.

On a motion by Member Gunby, seconded by Member Coen, the Board voted 5-0-1-0 (Member Lane absent) to approve the project subject to the Conditions of Approval and CEQA exemption.

**Motion passed.**

**b. Address:** 905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-342-003)

**Application #:** Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957

**Description:** The project consists of the demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sf addition to an existing 1926 Craftsman style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sf ADU above. The project complies with the development standards of the R-4 zoning district.

**Zone District/General Plan Designation:** R-4 / Residential High Density (up to 29 units per acre)

**Coastal Zone:** No  
**Archaeological Zone:** No  
**Historic Resources Inventory:** No  
**Area of Special Biological Significance:** Yes

**CEQA Status:** Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(l) (Residential Demolition) and 15303(a) (New Construction)

**Applicant/Owner:** MBA Architects, on behalf of Richard Gallagher, owner

**Staff Reference:** Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner | ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

Item continued to the February 12th meeting.

8. **Reports of ARB Members**

Member Gunby provided an update on the Downtown Design Guidelines subcommittee.
9. Reports of Council Liaison

None.

10. Staff Updates

Mark Brodeur, Community & Economic Development Director, provided the Board Members with a Design Review packet from the American Planning Association.

11. Adjournment at 4:15pm.

APPROVED BY ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
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TO: Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board
FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2019
PERMIT APPLICATION NO.: Admin. Architectural Permit (AAP) / Use Permit (UP) Application No. 18-0993
LOCATION: 642 Hillcrest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-652-015)
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Admin. Architectural Permit and Use Permit for the change of use of and exterior alterations to an existing 1,048 sq. ft. detached accessory building.
APPLICANT: Thomas Howe
ZONING/LAND USE: R-1 / Medium Density to 17.4 du/acre
CEQA: Categorical Exemption 15301(a), Exterior Alterations to Existing Facilities

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommend approval of the Admin. Architectural Permit and Use Permit to the Planning Commission for the change of use from greenhouse to storage and the exterior alterations that have occurred over the years. The recommendation of approval is subject to the recommended findings, conditions and a Class 1 CEQA exemption for Exterior Alterations to Existing Facilities.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
In accordance to PGMC Table 23.64.180, the subject building qualifies as a Category 1 Accessory Structure and is subject to an AAP and a UP because of its size over 120 sq. ft. This is a current code enforcement case because exterior and interior alterations and a change of use have occurred over the years without the benefit of permits. City records indicate that the subject building was issued a Building Permit (No. 2957) in 1962 under the adjacent property address to the north of 647 Spazier Avenue. The building was originally a greenhouse that accompanied another large greenhouse on 647 Spazier Avenue that was associated with the former owner’s flower business. The building is, at this point, considered legal, nonconforming, but the change of use from the permitted greenhouse to storage triggers the UP requirement. The unpermitted modifications include: 1) dividing
the building into two sections and converting the west half into an enclosed storage building of 708 sq. ft., including the installation of a concrete slab floor; 2) new exterior siding, windows, doors and electricity were added to this portion without permits; and 3) exterior improvements to the remaining 444 sq. ft. greenhouse (replacement of clear, plastic siding).

BACKGROUND
Site Description
The 8,167 sq. ft. property is developed with the subject detached accessory building, a detached 2-car garage, and a 1,048 sq. ft. single-story residence. The existing accessory building is also nonconforming in terms of setbacks. The following table shows the existing legal, non-conforming setbacks and the setbacks currently required in the R-1 zoning district by which new development would be reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Rear</th>
<th>Interior Side</th>
<th>Exterior Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Building’s</td>
<td>85’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>4’ (west) and 7’ (east)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>15’ (20’ for</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>10% of lot width or 7.5’ (specific to this lot)</td>
<td>20% of lot width (not to exceed 10’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>garage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1962 building permit was issued allowing these setbacks and it appears that the building has maintained its general footprint throughout the interior and exterior changes that have ensued. No expansion of the building is proposed.

Surrounding Land Uses
The project site is in an area developed with one- and two-story residences and the usual accessory buildings.

DISCUSSION
Applicable General Plan Policies
The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and polices that call for orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. This residential accessory building, while not directly resulting in an additional residential unit for the City’s housing stock, is a fairly typical use and design for a residential medium density neighborhood. The building may be converted to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the future under the proper review and authority of the Community Development Department.

Applicable Zoning Code Regulations
General Plan goals and policies are implemented by PGMC Title 23.

PGMC Chapter 23.16 describes the permitted uses and development standards of the R-1 zoning district. The intent of this chapter is to preserve the essential characteristics of the R-1 district including a general development pattern of primary and accessory dwelling units, and accessory buildings and uses that are compatible with a low- and moderate-density residential neighborhood. The Project Data Sheet is included as Attachment B.
The UP and AAP are triggered by the unpermitted alterations that have occurred over the years to an accessory building over 120 sq. ft. in size.

**Architecture and Design Consideration**
The 11’6” tall building has been generally rebuilt over the years and likely this ridge height may slightly exceed the original greenhouse height. As noted in the table above, the height may be up to 15’. The composition asphalt shingles, vinyl windows and sliding glass door, and Hardi-style horizontal siding are standard materials for residential development. The architectural elevations and site plan are included as Attachment C.

**Landscaping, Fencing and Exterior Lighting**
No changes to the landscaping or fencing are proposed at this time. The project includes the standard condition regarding outdoor lighting conforming to the City’s Architectural Review Guidelines #10-12.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**
In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(a), *Exterior Alterations to Existing Facilities*. This exemption can be used if the project meets all of the following criteria:

Section 15301(a) allows exterior alterations to existing structures resulting in little to no expansion of use.

The Class 1 categorical exemption is not subject to Exceptions per 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines pertaining to sensitive environmental concerns, cumulative impacts, significant effect due to unusual circumstances, scenic highways, hazardous waste or historical resources apply in this case.

**FINDINGS**
Staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval of UP/AAP 18-0993 to the Planning Commission subject to the recommended findings (see the Draft Permit in Attachment D).

**CONDITIONS**
Staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval of UP/AAP 18-0993 to the Planning Commission subject to the recommended conditions (see the Draft Permit in Attachment D).

**ATTACHMENTS**
A. Application
B. Project Data Sheet
C. Architectural Elevations, Materials and Site Plan
D. Draft Permit

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:**

\[Signature\]

Alyson Hunter
Associate Planner
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd
Permit Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>642 Hillcrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APN:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>AP+UP to legalize (F) accessory structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Applicant

Name: Thomas Howe  
Phone: 831.648.4018  
Email: CRMWVA@AOL.COM

Owner

Name: Same  
Phone:  
Email:  
Mailing Address:  

| Permit Request: |  
|-----------------|----------------|
| ☐ CRD: Counter Determination | ☐ SP: Sign Permit |
| ☐ AP: Architectural Permit | ☐ UP: Use Permit |
| ☐ AAP: Administrative AP | ☐ AUP: Administrative UP |
| ☐ ADC: Arch Design Change | ☐ ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit |
| ☐ ASP: Admin Sign Permit | ☐ LLA: Lot Line Adjustment |
| ☐ IHS: Initial Historic Screening | ☐ VAR: Variance |
| ☐ HPP: Historic Preservation | ☐ MMP: Mitigation Monitoring |
| ☐ A: Appeal | ☐ Stormwater Permit |
| ☐ TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't | ☐ Other:  |
| ☐ EIR: Environmental Impact | ☐ Other:  |

CEQA Determination:

☐ Exempt  
☐ Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration  
☐ Environmental Impact Report

Review Authority:

☐ Staff  ☐ HRC  
☐ ZA  ☐ PC  
☐ SPRC  ☐ CC  
☐ ARB  ☐  

Active Permits:

☐ Active Planning Permit  
☐ Active Building Permit  
☑ Active Code Violation Permit #:  

Overlay Zones:

☐ Butterfly Zone  
☐ Coastal Zone  
☐ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)  
☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHAN)

Property Information

Lot: 19  
Block: 2  
Tract:  
Lot Size: 75 x 109

☐ Historic Resources Inventory  
☐ Archaeologically Sensitive Area

Staff Use Only:

Received by: AO  
Assigned to: CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE COMMUNITY DEV DEPT

$5,847.20
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INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively "Indemnitees"), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnitees by reason of the City’s processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney’s fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City’s right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant’s inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City’s duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City’s misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: ___________________________ Date: 1/19/18

Owner Signature (Required): ___________________________ Date: 1/19/18
### Planning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update Fee</td>
<td>$233.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>$233.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>$334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees:** $5,847.20
**PROJECT DATA SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>642 Hillside Ave</th>
<th>Submittal Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant(s):</td>
<td>Thomas House</td>
<td>Permit Type(s) &amp; No(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REQUIRED/ Permitted</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone District</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Site Area</td>
<td>81,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (multi-family projects only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2540'</td>
<td>2540'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>3421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Footage not counted towards Gross Floor Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Surface Area Created and/or Replaced</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be demolished in feet &amp; % of total*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be built</td>
<td>11' 6&quot;</td>
<td>11' 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Setback</td>
<td>10' 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side Setback</td>
<td>10' 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Door Setback</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncovered Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Space Size</td>
<td>9' x 20'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Interior measurement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Driveways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Width(s)</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-up Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eave Projection (Into Setback)</td>
<td>3' maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances Between Eaves &amp; Property Lines</td>
<td>3' minimum</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Porch/Deck Projections</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Feature Projections</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number &amp; Category of Accessory Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building Setbacks</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between Buildings</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Building Heights</td>
<td>11' 6&quot;</td>
<td>11' 6&quot;</td>
<td>11' 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Heights</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If project proposes demolition to an HRI structure, also indicate % of proposed demolition of the surface of all exterior walls facing a public street or streets, if applicable.

[Rev. 01/14/14]
PROJECT DATA:

PROPERTY LOCATION:    642 HILLCREST AVE.
PACIFIC GROVE CA  93950

PROPERTY OWNER:          THOMAS HOWE
642 HILLCREST AVE
PACIFIC GROVE ,CA  93950
831-625-4018

PARCEL NUMBER:             006-652-015-000

LOT SIZE :                           8,200  SQ. FT.

ZONING :                             R-1

CONSTRUCTION:               TYPE V - B (U)
4'-0" (E) GREENHOUSE
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MATERIALS SAMPLE

EXISTING STORAGE / GREENHOUSE FLOOR PLAN

SITE PLAN

SITE PLAN

FLOOR PLAN, ELEVATIONS

EXISTING STORAGE / GREENHOUSE FLOOR PLAN

(E) STORAGE 708 s.f.
(E) GREENHOUSE 444 s.f.

(E) GARAGE 1048 s.f.

(E) ONE-STORY RESIDENCE
340 s.f.
ADMINISTRATIVE ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AAP) & USE PERMIT (UP) 18-0993 TO BRING UNPERMITTED CHANGES TO AN EXISTING 1,152 SQ. FT. DETACHED STORAGE BUILDING/GREENHOUSE INTO CONFORMANCE

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 642 Hillcrest Avenue, Pacific Grove, 93950 (APN 006-652-015)
2. The subject site has a designation of Medium Density Residential (up to 17.4 dwelling units/area) on the adopted City of Pacific Grove General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Single-Family Residential (R-1) zoning district.
4. The subject site is approximately 8,167 square feet in size.
5. The subject site is currently developed with a 1,048 sq. ft. single-story residence and a detached garage.
6. The subject site is located in the Area of Special Biological Significance, but not in the Archaeological Zone or the Coastal zone, nor is the property listed on the Historic Resources Inventory.
7. This project has been determined to be CEQA Exempt under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301(a), Exterior Alterations to Existing Facilities.

FINDINGS

For the Admin. Architectural Permit (same as for Architectural Permit): PGMC Sec. 23.70.060(f):
1. The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood;
2. The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
3. The Board has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review guidelines in making its determinations on the structure.

For the Use Permit: PGMC Section 23.70.080(b):
1. The proposed use is allowed with a use permit within the applicable zoning district and complies with all applicable provisions of these regulations;
2. The proposed use is consistent with the general plan, the local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan;
3. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use;
4. The use, as described and conditionally approved, will not be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city; and
5. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use are compatible with the existing and future land uses in the vicinity.

The size of the building and the fact that there are two detached accessory buildings including the garage, triggers the UP per PGMC Section 23.64.180. The unpermitted change of use from greenhouse to storage
accompanied by electrical, concrete, framing, and other activities that required Building Permits has resulted in a code enforcement issue. As a use that is accessory to the principally permitted residential development on the property, the subject building is consistent with the regulations and standards of the city. Once Building Permits have been issued verifying that electrical, framing and other activities have been undertaken in conformance with the California Building Code, the building will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood nor injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the city.

PERMIT
Admin. Architectural Permit (AAP) & Use Permit (UP) 18-0993. In accordance to PGMC Table 23.64.180, the subject building qualifies as a Category 1 Accessory Structure and is subject to an AAP and a UP because of its size over 120 sq. ft. This is a current code enforcement case because alterations have occurred over the years without the benefit of permits. City records indicate that the subject building was issued a Building Permit (No. 2957) in 1962 under the adjacent property address to the north of 647 Spazier Avenue. The building was originally a greenhouse that accompanied another large greenhouse on 647 Spazier Avenue that was associated with the former owner’s flower business. The building is, at this point, considered legal, nonconforming, but the change of use from the permitted greenhouse to storage triggers the UP requirement. The unpermitted modifications include: 1) dividing the building into two sections and converting the west half into an enclosed storage building of 708 sq. ft., including the installation of a concrete slab floor; 2) new exterior siding, windows, doors and electricity were added to this portion without permits; and 3) exterior improvements to the remaining 444 sq. ft. greenhouse (replacement of clear, plastic siding).

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. **Permit Expiration.** This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.

2. **Construction Compliance.** All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require Architectural Review Board approval.

3. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

4. **Public Works, Fire and Building.** Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit. Any work within the public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit prior to issuance of the building permit.

5. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

6. **Exterior Lighting.** All exterior lighting fixtures shall conform to Architectural Review Guidelines #10-12.

**This permit does not authorize the use the detached accessory building as an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) or for any other type of human habitation. The conversion of the building(s) to an ADU without required permits is a violation of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code §23.80.040.**
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:

1. The Board recommends that the Planning Commission, at a separate noticed public hearing, determine that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Board recommends that the Planning Commission approve File No. AAP/UP 18-0993 as conditioned and pursuant to CEQA categorical exemption 15301(a), Exterior Alterations to Existing Facilities.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the Planning Commission’s action 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:

APPROVED:

Sarah Boyle, Chair __________________________ Date __________________________

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

________________________________________ Date

Thomas Howe, owner
This page left blank intentionally
TO: Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board
FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2019
PERMIT APPLICATION NO.: Architectural Permit (AP) Application No. 18-0733
LOCATION: 246 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
(APN 006-281-008)
SUBJECT: A 2,783 sq. ft. second-story, rear addition to a downtown commercial building and replacement of large window on its Forest Ave. façade. The second-story addition consists of two, 2-bedroom residential units.
APPLICANT/AGENT: Mugo & Talin Tersakyan / Jeanne Byrne, FAIA
ZONING/LAND USE: Downtown Commercial (C-D) / Commercial
CEQA: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15331 and 15301, Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation and Minor Additions, respectively
RECOMMENDATION
Approve the project subject to the recommended findings, conditions, and Sections 15331 and 15301 CEQA exemption(s).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project consists of a 2,783 sq. ft. second-story, rear addition to a commercial building that has been determined to be a historic resource eligible for the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). The proposed addition will contain two, 2-bedroom residential units with small patios overlooking 16th Street. Also included are minor alterations to the first floor rear façade abutting 16th Street including a modified garage door that will be inset slightly to address slope and vehicular maneuvering requirements, the relocation of one door and addition of two new doors for fire and access purposes, and removal of 3 existing windows.

The upstairs addition will include stucco siding materials and will continue the parapet wall and trim treatment in a way that is sympathetic to the existing building. The windows
and doors will be wood-clad aluminum with larger lights and glass patio railings that reflect a modern design as a way to distinguish the new from the old. Lastly, the project will return a large window to the commercial front façade which had been previously filled in; the new window will match the existing Forest Avenue windows.

**Permit Discussion**

Under the assumption that the building is a historic resource, the applicant obtained the services of a qualified historian who prepared a Phase II Historic Assessment (Seavey, August 2018, Attachment C) which addresses what potential impacts to the historic resource that a 2,783 sq. ft. second-story, rear residential addition might have. As mentioned previously, the 1923 building is not on the City’s Historic Resources Inventory but, according to the qualified historian, it retains significant historic integrity in terms of setting, location, design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association, and can be considered eligible for the HRI, thus making it a historic resource under Section 21084.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

The City’s practice has been to review the recommendations and findings provided by the qualified historian and move the project forward to the ARB if the historian’s findings indicate that the proposed improvements are in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and, therefore, exempt from environmental review under CEQA Categorical Exemption §15331. In this case, the historian indicates that the proposed project meets the Secretary’s Standards and will not result in a significant negative impact to the historic resource, thus qualifying for the CEQA exemption.

**Parking.** Although no onsite parking is required because of the property’s location in the Downtown Business District, the project is conditioned on the owner obtaining three (3) annual parking permits for the 16th Street lot to provide at least nearby guaranteed overnight parking for residents of the proposed units. As no exceptions to the development standards of the C-D zoning district are proposed, the project does not require a Historic Preservation Permit. The facts of the project, required findings, conditions of approval and CEQA exemption are described in the draft Permit (Attachment B).

**BACKGROUND**

**Site Description**

The 1923 single-story concrete commercial building, currently housing the Mum’s Furniture Store, is built with zero setbacks and enjoys 100% lot coverage as is allowed in the C-D zoning district. The existing garage off 16th Street has been used as a loading dock for commercial businesses over the years. There is currently no parking provided onsite, but the property is within the Downtown Parking District which relieves the standard parking requirements for commercial businesses.

**Surrounding Land Uses**

The property is located between Forest Avenue and 16th Street, abutting Laurel Avenue on the south. It is adjacent to City Hall on the other side of Laurel and the Grove Market to the north. There are five (5) single-family residences on the west side of 16th Street, and the Fandango restaurant and a city parking lot are located 25 and 50 feet, respectively, to the northwest.
DISCUSSION
Applicable General Plan Policies
The neighborhood is designated Commercial with an allowed density range between 20 and 30 dwelling units per acre. The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and policies that call for the orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. This residential project helps the City achieve several of its housing goals as stated in the General Plan including the following:

*Chapter 3, Housing*

Policy 8: Strive to accommodate the City’s share of the region’s housing needs.

Policy 21: Continue to designate residential land in appropriate land use and zoning categories as needed to accommodate projected household growth and to maintain normal vacancy rates.

*Chapter 7, Historic Preservation*

Policy 10: Require owners of properties on the HRI to maintain such structures.

Policy 16: Promote recognition of the relationship between historic preservation and an economic environment that encourages pride and identity.

Policy 17: Recognize relationships between historic preservation and the protection of individual property values.

The policies above are implemented through the Downtown Commercial (C-D) zoning district which allows single- and multi-family residential, and mixed-use development in areas with adequate public services.

Applicable Land Use Plan and Zoning Code Regulations
The City of Pacific Grove’s zoning code designates the subject parcel as Downtown Commercial (C-D) zoning district which allows single- and multi-family residential and mixed-use development in areas with adequate public services.

The HRC is the review authority for Architectural Permits that propose exterior modifications to historic resources and properties on the HRI per PGMC §23.70.070.

The Phase II Historic Assessment indicates that the activities proposed will not result in a significant negative impact to the historic resource, that the activities conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and that the project qualifies for the Class 31, §15331 CEQA exemption. The Phase II Assessment goes on to state: Consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, under the treatment of building sites and for new additions to historic buildings, the proposed additions will be located at the rear, and on inconspicuous sides of the historic buildings and limited in size
and scale in relationship to them [sic]. Every feasible effort will be made to preserve the features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character. (Seavey, August 2018)

The Architectural Permit (AP) is required per Section 23.70.060(c)(1) of the PGMC. The required findings for the AP are located in the Permit (Attachment B).

Architecture and Design Consideration
As described in the Phase II Historic Assessment (Seavey, August 2018), the owners propose to: (1) return the one altered front window to its original 1923 appearance; and (2) add two, second-story apartments, with a parking garage below, on the rear (west) elevation of the building envelope along 16th Street, a one-way street. Both units will be wood-framed, stucco-clad, to match existing, with very low-pitched, front-gabled parapet roofs, and a recessed open terrace between them. Paired with modern fenestration, the new features will be clearly differentiated from the original building envelope, and partially screened from the south by existing street trees along Laurel Avenue.

These proposed changes were addressed in the Phase II Assessment and found to be appropriate for the historic resource. Furthermore, the addition and exterior alterations are in compliance with Appendix 1 of the Architectural Review Guidelines which specifically address additions to historic buildings, how best to preserve character-defining features, compatibility of new and old, and replacement materials.

Landscape & Lighting
As the existing building covers the entire site, there is no landscaping currently, nor is any new landscaping proposed. Standard residential exterior lighting is proposed for the upstairs terraces that will be down-shielded and night-sky compliant as consistent with Architectural Guideline Nos. 10 - 12. The lighting in the downstairs access alcoves will be recessed in the ceiling and not visible from the street.

Stormwater Treatment Measure
As the project does not include any ground disturbing activities, the proposed mixed-use development does not trigger a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)
In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemptions, Sections 15331, Class 31, Historical Restoration/Rehabilitation, and 15301(e), Class 1, Minor Alterations.

The Class 31 exemption consists of projects limited to maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction of historical resources in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15331).
The Class 1, Section 15301(e) exemption consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination. The types of "existing facilities" itemized below are not intended to be all-inclusive of the types of projects which might fall within Class 1. The key consideration is whether the project involves negligible or no expansion of an existing use.

Examples include: (e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than: (1) 50 percent of the floor area of the structures before the addition, or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less.

Neither of these classes of exemption is subject to the exceptions listed in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines.

FINDINGS
Staff recommends if AP 18-0733 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended findings (see Attachment B, Draft Permit).

CONDITIONS
Staff recommends if AP 18-0733 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended conditions (see Attachment B, Draft Permit).

ATTACHMENTS
A. Application
B. Draft Permit
C. Phase II Historic Assessment (Seavey, August 2018)
D. Site Plan & Elevations, Materials, and Project Data Sheet

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

__________________________
Alyson Hunter
Associate Planner
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd

Permit Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No. 9A</th>
<th>Page 6 of 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>246 FOREST AVE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>ADD 2 LIVING UNITS AT REAR OF (5) BUILDING &amp; 2ND FL. ADDITION. 2 PARKING SPACES &amp; EMERGENCY ACCESS AT GROUND LEVEL. WATER MAINS LIST FOR UNITS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Work?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>JEANNE C. BYRNE, FAIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>372-6586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JCBARCHFAIA@ATT.NET">JCBARCHFAIA@ATT.NET</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>591 LIGHTHOUSE AVE. #5 PACIFIC GROVE CA 93950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>MUGO &amp; TALIN TERSAKYAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>372-6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>246 FOREST AVE. PACIFIC GROVE CA 93950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Permit Request: | |
| CRD: Counter Determination | |
| AP: Architectural Permit | |
| AAP: Administrative AP | |
| ADC: Arch Design Change | |
| ASP: Admin Sign Permit | |
| SP: Sign Permit | |
| UP: Use Permit | |
| AUP: Administrative UP | |
| ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit | |
| LLA: Lot Line Adjustment | |
| LM: Lot Merger | |
| IHS: Initial Historic Screening | |
| HPP: Historic Preservation | |
| A: Appeal | |
| TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev’t | |
| EIR: Environmental Impact | |
| VAR: Variance | |
| MMP: Mitigation Monitoring | |
| Stormwater Permit | |
| Other: | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Determination:</th>
<th>Review Authority:</th>
<th>Active Permits:</th>
<th>Overlay Zones:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>☐ Staff ☐ HRC</td>
<td>☐ Active Planning Permit</td>
<td>☐ Butterfly Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Study &amp; Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
<td>☐ ZA ☐ PC</td>
<td>☐ Active Building Permit</td>
<td>☐ Coastal Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>☐ SPRC ☐ CC</td>
<td>☐ Active Code Violation Permit #:</td>
<td>☐ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ ARB</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Historic Resources Inventory</td>
<td>☑ Archaeologically Sensitive Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Staff Use Only: | |
| Received by: | AUG 21 2018 |
| Assigned to: | |

CERTIFICATION – I, the undersigned, under penalty of perjury, depose and certify that I am the applicant for this request, that the property owner approves this application and that all statements contained herein, including all documents and plans submitted in connection with this application, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.
I further acknowledge it is my responsibility to determine whether additional permits are required.

Applicant Signature: [Signature] Date: 06/26/18
Owner Signature (Required): [Signature] Date: 06/26/18
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# Planning Fee Calculation

## Permit Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family <strong>commercial (base)</strong></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>$3,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>$820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening <strong>Historic Determination</strong></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>$420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>$1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>25% of fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update Fee</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$594.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fees: $5,694.80
ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AP) 18-0733
FOR A SECOND-STORY, TWO-UNIT RESIDENTIAL ADDITION TO AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING (MUM’S PLACE) LOCATED AT 246 FOREST AVENUE

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 246 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, 93950 (APN 006-281-008).
2. The subject site has a designation of Commercial (20-30 dwelling units per acre) on the adopted City of Pacific Grove General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Downtown Commercial (C-D) zoning district. This zoning district allows mixed uses (residential above or behind commercial) per PGMC Table §23.31.030.
4. The subject site is 11,413 square feet in size and is 100% developed with an existing single-story commercial building.
5. The subject site is located in the Area of Special Biological Significance, but not in the Coastal zone, the Butterfly Buffer Zone, nor any other areas known to possess sensitive habitat.
6. The property has been determined by a qualified historian to be a historic resource. A Phase II Historic Assessment has been prepared (Seavey, August 2018) which identifies the character-defining features of the resource and indicates that the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and that, therefore, a Section 15331 CEQA exemption for Historic Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation is appropriate.
7. The project has been determined to be further exempt from CEQA under Section 15301(e)(2), Additions to Existing Facilities.
8. Because the property is located in the PG Business District and is planned and zoned for Downtown Commercial uses, no parking spaces are required.

FINDINGS
For the Architectural Permit per PGMC Section 23.70.060(f):
1. The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood;
2. The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
3. The board has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review guidelines in making its determinations on the structure.

The 2,783 sq. ft. (total) second-story addition which will contain two, 2-bedroom apartments will be visible from the 16th Street and Laurel Avenue frontages, but will be only nominally visible behind the existing parapet wall on the main historic storefront on Forest Avenue. The proposed new materials and architectural features will be complimentary to the existing building including the continuation of the stucco and Modern Broad Front Style with parapet walls and trim details. The first floor on 16th Street will be altered slightly with the addition of and/or relocation of 3 man doors; the existing garage door will be replaced and set into the wall slightly to address slope and vehicular access issues.

A Phase II Historic Assessment (Seavey, August 2018) was prepared for the project. The report states that neither the proposed addition nor returning the front façade window will impact the remaining character-defining features or overall historic integrity of the building and that the project is in substantial conformance to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposed second-story addition to the rear 1/3 of the building will help ensure that the original façade of Forest Avenue frontage, including the window...
replacement, remains intact. The project is in compliance with the historical design appendices of the Architectural Review Guidelines specifically relating to: neighborhood context, effects on scale and character, the preservation of character-defining features, and the compatibility of new with old.

**PERMIT**

Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0733 to allow:
- The development of two, 2-bedroom, second-floor apartments with a total square footage of 2,783;
- The return of the full-size window at the northeast corner of the Forest Ave. façade to match existing; and
- Improvements to the 16th Street frontage relating to the existing garage and ingress/egress doors.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1. **Permit Expiration.** This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within two (2) years from and after the date of approval in compliance with PGMC §23.73.050(b). Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.

2. **Construction Compliance.** All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require Architectural Review Board approval.

3. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community and Economic Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

4. **Public Works, Fire and Building.** Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit. Work taking place in the public right-of-way, including the development of a new residential driveway and the relocation of the existing PG&E guy wires, shall require an encroachment permit prior to issuance of the building permit.

5. **Parking Permits.** Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the owner shall obtain three (3) annual parking permits for the 16th Street Municipal Parking Lot.

6. **Window on Forest Ave. Elevation.** As indicated on the approved plan(s), the window opening at the northeast corner of the Forest Ave. façade shall be replaced to match the existing windows.

7. **Water.** Evidence of adequate potable water shall be provided at the time of Building Permit submittal. If water is not available, the property will be added to the City’s water wait list.

8. **Construction Hours.** All construction activities shall comply to PGMC Section 11.96.040.

9. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD (ARB) OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:**

1. The ARB determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.
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Permit No. AP 18-0733
2. The ARB authorizes Approval of AP 18-0733 as conditioned and pursuant to Class 31 and Class 1 CEQA categorical exemptions for Historic Rehabilitation/Restoration and Minor Additions, respectively.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE 12th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTENTIONS:  

APPROVED:  

_______________________________  
Sarah Boyle, Chair  

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

_______________________________  
Mugo & Talin Tersakyan, owner(s)  

Date
August 10, 2018

Jeanne Byrne, FAIA
591 Lighthouse Ave., Suite 5
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Dear Ms. Byrne:

Introduction:

This Phase II Historic Assessment has been prepared on behalf of Migirdic Tersakyan as part of an application for additions and alterations to the City Hall Garage, located at 264 Forest Ave. (APN# 006-281-008), in Pacific Grove (see photos, plans & drawings provided).

Historical Background & Description:

The subject property is a 1923 one-story, concrete, enframed window-wall commercial building, in a Modern Broad Front Style, rectangular in plan, resting on a concrete foundation. The exterior wall-cladding is poured concrete and stucco, with a decorative brick-faced facade, below a pedimented, stepped roof parapet. The roof system itself consists of two, wood-framed, low-gabled components running parallel on an east-west axis, covered in built-up roofing. Fenestration is irregular, with a combination of large, fixed two and three-light showroom windows, with heavy mullions, and multi-paned transoms above, on the Forest Ave. facade, and on the north end of the south side-elevation. Much Smaller fixed windows characterize the west end of the Laurel St. elevation. The former wide-brick-framed garage entrance, on the south side of the facade was in filled by recessed full-height glazed windows and doors in the late 1970s. The building envelope runs the length of Laurel Ave. from Forest Ave. to 16th Street.
As originally constructed in 1923, the brick facade had a one-car arched-entry, that was widened after 1930, and a large exit opening about halfway along the building envelope on Laurel Ave. that was enclosed sometime c. 1970. The commercial building is sited on the north side of Laurel Ave. between Forest Ave. and 16th St., across from City Hall, with mature street trees screening part of the Laurel Ave. elevation. It is located in an active commercial district with retail shops, businesses and public offices of varying ages, sizes and styles.

Character-defining features include its rectangular plan; concrete construction; enframed window-wall facade, with decorative brick work; pedimented parapet roof and large, multi-paned showroom type windows, one of which was in filled c. 1970.

It is significant, within the theme of Pacific Grove Comes of Age (1903-1926) in the subset of The Advent of the Automobile, established in the 2011 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement. Its period of significance would be 1923-1935 (see California DPR 523 documentation provided).

Project Description

Based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Treatment of Historic Properties, the appropriate treatment approach would be Rehabilitation. The owners will maintain the property in its commercial use. They propose to (1) return the one altered front window to its original 1923 appearance. (2) add two second story apartments, with parking garages below, on the rear elevation (west) of the building envelope along sixteenth, a one-way street (see photos, photos & plans and drawings provided). Both units will be wood-framed and stucco-clad, to match existing, with very low-pitched front-gabled parapet roofs, and a recessed open terrace space between them. Paired with modern fenestration, the new features will be clearly differentiated from the original building envelope, and partially screened from the south by existing street trees along Laurel Ave., consistent with Rehabilitation Standard #9 (see photos, plans & drawings provided).

Evaluation for Significance

Introduction

The following summarizes the National, State and local criteria and provides an evaluation of historic significance for each criteria level.
National, State and Local Registration Criteria

Historic resources may be designated on the federal, state or local level. Generally, to be eligible for listing, a resource must be historically significant and retain enough historic integrity to convey that significance. The criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources and the Pacific Grove Historic Preservation Ordinance are described below.

National Register of Historic Places (NR)

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to create a National Register of Historic Places. Districts, sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture are eligible for listing if they meet at least one of four criteria (16 U.S.C. 470, et seq., as amended. 36 C.F. R. 60.1(a).) Eligible resources are those:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, or
B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history.

Eligible resources must also retain sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to convey the relevant historic significance (36 C.F.R. 60. 1(a). The seven aspects of integrity are described later in this section.
California Register of Historic Resources (CR)

A resource is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources if it:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California history and cultural heritage.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic value.
4. Has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (California Public Resources Code 5024 1(c)).

The California Code of Regulations notes that integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity as evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Resources eligible for listing in the California Register must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and convey the reasons for their significance.

The same seven aspects of integrity are considered when evaluating resources for listing in the National Register and California Register: Location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. Alterations over time or historic changes in use may themselves be significant. However, resources that may not retain enough integrity to meet National Register criteria may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.

City of Pacific Grove Historic Preservation Ordinance

The criteria employed by Pacific Grove for designation of historic resources are the same general standards by which the significance of a historic property is judged for inclusion in the National (NR) and/or California Register (CR), and are included in General Plan Chapter 7: Historic and Archaeological Resources, and the Historic Preservation Ordinance, Pacific Grove Municipal Code Chapter 23.76.
Historic Integrity

National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation defines historic integrity as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” Historic properties either retain their integrity or they do not. To retain integrity, a resource will always retain several and usually most of the seven aspects of integrity.

1. Location: the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
2. Design: the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
3. Setting: the physical environment of a historic property.
4. Materials: the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
5. Workmanship: the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
6. Feeling: a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
7. Association: the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

National Register Bulletin 15 notes that evaluating historic integrity may be a subjective analysis, but is always based on understanding the property’s physical features and how they relate to the property’s historic significance. The integrity evaluation can begin only after the evaluator establishes the property’s significance: why it is significant (identifying its area of significance and how it meets the relevant National, State and Local designation criteria), where it is important (location), and when the resource is significant (its “period of significance”).
Eligibility for historic listing of buildings, structures, objects, sites and districts, i.e., rests on the twin factors of historic significance and integrity to be considered for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the 2007 Pacific Grove Historic Resources Survey. Loss of integrity, if sufficiently great, will overwhelm the historic significance a resource may possess and render it ineligible for historic listing. Likewise, a resource can have complete integrity, but if it lacks significance, it must also be considered ineligible.

The National and California Registers, as well as the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Survey adopt the same methods of establishing historic integrity, as described above.

**National and California Register Significance**

The City Hall Garage is not significant under National (NR), but does meet the State (CR) Register’s criteria. It is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (CR-1). It was constructed 1923 for Pacific Grove businessman Louis F. Bambauer by architect Paul V. Tuttle, and constructed by Pacific Grove contractor William P. Sweeney. It does not qualify for association with a significant person from the past (CR-2). However, the subject property, as a good representative example of an architect designed concrete, enframed window-wall commercial building, in a Modern Broad Front Style, does qualify under (CR-3) as one of the very few essentially intact examples of a 1920s automotive garage remaining in the community. The building clearly embodies the distinctive characteristics of the then popular commercial Modern Broad Front Style of architecture, as described in its character-defining features seen above, and the California DPR 523 provided. As previously noted, one of the proposed changes will return the commercial facade closer to its 1923-1935 appearance. It should be listed in the 2007 Pacific Grove Historic Resources Survey for its architectural design, under the theme of Pacific Grove Comes of Age (1903-1926) in the subset of, The Advent of the Automobile, established in the 2011 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement.
Evaluation of Historic Integrity

The subject property was somewhat altered in the 1970s, & 1990s. Known permitted changes during that time are noted under Section B6 of the California DPR523 provided.

The seven aspects of Integrity are:

- **Setting**: The residence is in its original residential commercial district setting, adjacent to the City Hall that it derives its name from. The subject property still retains sufficient integrity of setting.
- **Location**: The Commercial building remains in its original location, giving it integrity of location.
- **Design**: The commercial building still retains most of its original design, as constructed 1923. Changes, noted above, have somewhat diminished but not compromised the integrity of its design.
- **Workmanship**: In spite of the changes noted above, the Commercial building still retains much of its integrity of workmanship.
- **Materials**: Minor changes not withstanding, the commercial building retains most of its original materials.
- **Feeling**: The commercial building retains sufficient character-defining features, including its immediate landscape setting to retain its integrity of feeling.
- **Association**: The residence retains its integrity of association, in the context of its commercial district setting.

Conclusion

The subject property has undergone some inevitable changes over its 94 years in service. However, because of its basically intact commercial design by architect Paul V. Tuttle, it continues to evoke a strong sense of time and place and of feeling and association with commercial development in Pacific Grove in the mid 1920s, as a physical expression of the Automobile Coming of Age.
It clearly qualifies as a historic resource under criterion (CR-3) in the context the theme noted above in the 2011 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement.

IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Introduction

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (standards) provides the framework for evaluating the impacts of additions and alterations to historic buildings. The Standards describe four treatment approaches: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction. The Standards require that the treatment approach be determined first, as a different set of Standards apply to each approach. For the subject property, the treatment approach is rehabilitation. The Standards describe rehabilitation as: historic building materials and character-defining features are protected and maintained as they are in the treatment for Preservation; however, an assumption is made prior to the work that existing historic fabric has become damaged or deteriorated over time and, as a result more repair and replacement will be required.

Thus, latitude is given in the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation to replace extensively deteriorated, damaged, or missing features using either traditional or substitute materials. Of the four treatments, only Rehabilitation includes an opportunity to make possible an efficient contemporary use through alterations and additions. (see The Secretary of the interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1995).

The ten standards for rehabilitation are:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive material, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features, spaces or elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a historic property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner, that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
Project Impacts

The proposed project includes additions above the previously altered rear (west), and south-side elevations. The proposed additions will provide for a more efficient contemporary use by expanding the existing building envelope vertically to provide needed living space, and their required garages. Proposed alterations include:

- Addition of two two-bedroom apartments above the rear (west) 1/3 of the building envelope, to include a portion of the south side-elevation.
- Addition of two, off street, one-car garage along 16th Street.
- Return of the in filled window on the Forest Ave. facade to its original 1923 appearance.

All new work will be undertaken in conformance with the *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, under the Standard for Rehabilitation.*

The Secretary's Standards encourages "placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation." and locating alterations to historic properties in areas where previous alterations already exist. The 1992 National Park Service *Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings,* states that "The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

In this instance, the proposed rehab work will add two new apartments above the rear (west) 1/3 of a secondary and altered elevation of the main building block, with off street parking below. of the main building block. The new features will be separated by an open roof terrace (see photos, & plans and drawings provided). The apartments will employ modern fenestration and detailing to clearly differentiate the historic building envelope from the new, but reflect the general character of the original automotive garage, consistent with Rehabilitation Standard #9. Return of the in filled window on the Forest Ave. facade to its original 1923 appearance.
The proposed new additions are designed and will be constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic buildings and their environment will not be radically changed.

The new elements will reflect the existing historic building fabric for continuity of design. The work will be compatible with the size, scale, proportions and massing of the historic resource to protect the integrity of the subject property and its environment. This is consistent with Rehabilitation Standard #2, #5.

Consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, under the treatment of building sites and for new additions to historic buildings, the proposed additions will be located at the rear, and on inconspicuous sides of the historic buildings and limited in size and scale in relationship to them. Every feasible effort will be made to preserve the features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character, retaining the relationship between buildings, landscape features and open space. If removed in future, the essential form and integrity of the historic residence will be unimpaired, consistent with Rehabilitation Standards #9 and #10 (see photos, plans and drawings provided).

**Impacts of the Proposed Project:**

The owners have proposed the following additions & alterations for contemporary usage.

**EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION (primary, altered)**

Replace existing c. 1990s brick and glass block in fill in an original 1923 window opening with glazing, matching in kind, that found in two original windows on this elevation (see photos and plans & drawings provided).

**NORTH SIDE-ELEVATION (secondary, altered)**

Add new second floor apartment, with an open west facing terrace on the rear (west) 1/3 of this elevation, and one toward the north., New, modern fenestration to clearly differentiate the new construction from the old, as well as visually somewhat limiting its size and scale, by orientation in relationship to the historic buildings.
If the proposed addition is removed in future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, consistent with Rehabilitation Standards #9 & #10 (see photos and plans & drawings provided).

WEST (REAR) ELEVATION (secondary, altered)

Add two new apartments above the rear (west) 1/3 of a secondary and altered elevation of the main building block, with off street parking below. of the main building block. The new features will be separated by an open roof terrace. The apartments will employ modern fenestration and detailing to clearly differentiate the historic building envelope from the new, as well as visually limiting its size and scale, by orientation, in relationship to the historic building to reflect the general character of the original automotive garage, consistent with Rehabilitation Standard #9 The apartment entries and overhead garage doors will be slightly recessed into the building envelope on this elevation(see plans and drawings provided).

NOTE: Any modifications to the site must consider the existing street trees, in terms of compliance with City tree protection ordinances.

WEST SIDE-ELEVATION (secondary, altered)

Add new second floor apartment on the rear (west) 1/3 of this elevation., New, modern fenestration to clearly differentiate the new construction from the old, as well as visually somewhat limiting its size and scale, by orientation, in relationship to the historic buildings. This portion of the proposed addition will be partially screened by existing mature street trees along Laurel Avenue. If the proposed addition is removed in future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, consistent with Rehabilitation Standards #9 & #10 (see photos and plans & drawings provided).

As proposed, the work shall reuse, to the extent feasible, any available historic building material, and where necessary match required replacement features, in kind (see photos and plans & drawings provided).
New work will be clearly differentiated from the old, but compatible with the size, scale, proportions and massing to protect the integrity of the subject property and its environment. If removed in future, the essential form and integrity of the historic resource and its environment will be unimpaired.

**Mitigation of Project Impacts**

As stated above, the proposed treatment plan for the commercial building is rehabilitation. The proposed project requires no other mitigation than compliance with City forestation regulations, because it follows the *Standards*, as outlined below.

1. *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive material, features, spaces and spatial relationships.*

The building is being retained in commercial use, which supports this Standard.

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

Based on the character-defining features of the enframed window wall commercial building type, and its Modern Broad Front Style, as they appear in the 2018 DPR 523, the east facing façade and part of the south side-elevation are the principal character-defining features of the subject property. They will essentially remain the same.

The second floor treatment for the rear-elevation, given its limited depth and stepped back element on the original building envelope, as well as existing screening by street trees along the Laurel Ave. side-elevation assure the prominence of the historic commercial facade. As the proposed work is primarily off already altered secondary elevations, the subject property should not be obscured, damaged or destroyed by these changes, which supports this Standard.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features, spaces or elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken.

The original 1924 commercial building has had alterations over time, on all elevations. The proposed design of the apartment and garage additions makes very clear what is historic and what is new, without creating a false sense of historical development with conjectural elements from other historic properties, which supports this Standard.

4. Changes to a historic property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The c.1970s window alteration to the building envelope and its fenestration are inconsistent with the original character-defining features of the commercial facade. It is both non-historic and detracts from the original character of the historic building. Its removal and replacement with a feature matching, in kind, existing historic windows along the elevation will support this Standard.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The only proposed material change to the original building envelope will be the addition of the new apartments and garage spaces off the rear (west) elevation and minor parts of the north and south elevation. By design it will have minimum visual impact from Laurel Ave., and is reversible, consistent with Standard #10.

Repair and maintenance of examples of craftsmanship exhibited on the existing historic building envelope will occur as necessary, consistent with National Park Service preservation standards, thus satisfying Standard #5.
6. **Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced.** Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

The proposed project will repair, in kind, deteriorated historic features. Window replacement, will be with in-kind materials. Standard #6 is satisfied.

7. **Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.**

The Standard will be satisfied by employing the gentlest means possible if the commercial building is repainted.

8. **Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.**

This Standard is not applicable.

9. **New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.** The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

There should be little loss of historic building fabric as the proposed work is primarily off already altered or secondary elevations. The related new construction will be mostly through the existing roof system, with entry and garage doors flush with the rear (west) elevation, which faces 16th, a one-way street.
As noted above, the new work will be clearly differentiated from the old and compatible with the historic fabric, as well as reasonably compatible with the size, scale and proportion and massing of the historic commercial building to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, thus satisfying Standard #9.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner, that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

The proposed additions could be removed in future, as they rest on top of the original commercial building envelope, in altered, secondary locations, thus satisfying the Standard.

NOTE: The Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation is defined “as the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values.” The Standard proposes “placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation.” and locating alterations to historic properties in areas where previous alterations already exist. The 1992 National Park Service *Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*, states that “The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

That being said, the National Parks Service 2010 Preservation Brief #14 emphasizes “the focus on new additions is to ensure that they preserve the character of historic building.” Preservation of significant historic material, compatibility of the addition and its differentiation from the historic property are the desired results of this approach.

As regards the City Hall Garage, filling a full city block along Laurel Ave. between Forest Ave. and 16th St., the significant historic material, i.e. the Paul V. Tuttle facade along Forest Ave., will be returned to its 1924-1935 historic appearance.
The proposed addition takes up about 1/3 of the altered, secondary rear elevation on an inconspicuous portion of the very large building envelope, and is sufficiently differentiated from the historic, architectural and culturally significant portion of the subject property to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and to adequately address the concerns cited in National Park Service Preservation Brief #14.

Conclusion:

The proposed work on the subject property will be executed consistent with the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation, with the least possible loss of historic material so that the remaining character-defining features of the resource, and its environment will not be obscured, damaged or destroyed. The proposed additions are reversible. As proposed the new work should not cause a significant change to the listed historic residence, and will not create a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation

The proposed project appears to be in conformance with the Secretary of The Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties under the Standard for Rehabilitation. (see documentation, photos and plans & drawings provided). However, mitigation will be required through appropriate City approvals for any tree removal for the construction site which is needed for this project.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
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City Hall Garage, Pacific Grove

Photo #1. Looking SW at the east facing facade of the City Hall Garage, C. 1935. Photographer unknown.

Photo #2. Looking NW at the east facing facade, note altered window at far right, Kent Seavey, July, 2018.
Photo #3. Looking NE at the rear (west), and south side-elevations, note altered, secondary rear elevation, Kent Seavey, July, 2018.
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*Resource Name or #: (Assigned by records) City Hall Garage

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location:
- [ ] Not for Publication
- [ ] Unrestricted

P2a. County: Monterey
P2b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Monterey
P2c. Address: 246 Forest Avenue
P2d. City: Pacific Grove
P2e. Zip Code: 93950

P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
The subject property is a one-story, concrete, enframed window wall commercial building, in a Modern Broad Front Style. The exterior wall-cladding is poured concrete and stucco, with a decorative brick-faced facade, below a pedimented, stepped roof parapet. The roof system itself consists of two, wood-framed low-gabled elements running parallel on an east west axis, covered in built-up roofing. Fenestration is irregular, with a combination of large, fixed two and three light show room windows, with heavy mullions, and multi-pane transoms above on the Forest St. facade, and on the north end of the south side-elevation. Much smaller fixed windows characterize the west end of the Laurel St. elevation. The former wide brick-framed garage entrance, on the south side of the facade was in filled by recessed full height glazed windows and doors in the late c. 1970. The building envelope runs the full length of Laurel Ave. from Forest Ave. to 16th Street.

P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) Commercial building (HP6)

P5a. Photograph or Drawing: (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (view, date, accession #)
Looking NW at the east facing facade & south side-elevation, Kent Seavey, July 17, 2018.

P6. Date Constructed/ Age and Source: 1923-Mo. Co. Assessor's records

P7. Owner and Address:
Mulgicic Tennisian, 246 Forest Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950

P8. Recorded by: Kent Seavey, 310 Lighthouse Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950

P9. Date Recorded: July 26, 2018

P10. Survey Type: (Describe) Intensive-required CEQA review

P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none.") None

*Required information
**Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder)**: City Center Garage  
**NRHP Status Code**: SS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1. Historic Name:</th>
<th>City Center Garage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2. Common Name:</td>
<td>Munn's Place Furniture Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Original Use:</td>
<td>Auto Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Present Use:</td>
<td>Furniture store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Architectural Style:</td>
<td>Modern Broadfront Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction History:**
1923, Mo. Co. Assessor's records; exterior remodel, 1970 (PGBP# 176); exterior remodel 1971 (PGBP# 553); new exterior facade, 1972 (PGBP# 247); re-point bricks on facade, 1987 (PGBP# 87-0069); remove two skylights and re-roof, 1990 (PGBP# 90-0482); exterior alterations 1994 (PGBP# 1928-94); add awnings 1997 (PGBP# 2303-97); in fill window w/glass blocks (PGBP# 2273-97);

**B7. Moved?**  ☐No  ☐Yes  ☐Unknown  **Date**:  **Original Location**:  

**B8. Related Features**:  

**B9a. Architect**: Paul V. Tuttle  
**B10. Significance: Theme**: PG Comes of Age (1903-1926)  
**Area**: Pacific Grove  
**Period of Significance**: 1923  
**Property Type**: com. bldg.  
**Applicable Criteria**: CR-3  

The City Center Garage is significant under California Register (CR) Criterion 3, in the area of architecture, as the best remaining example of a period (1923) automotive garage remaining in Pacific Grove, from the advent of the automobile coming of age in the community. Designed for Pacific Grove businessman Louis F. Bambauer, by Pacific Grove architect Paul V. Tuttle, and built by Pacific Grove contractor, William P Sweeney the subject property retains sufficient historic and physical integrity to be listed at the local level of significance in the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory. It was first identified as the City Hall Garage, under the ownership of William E. Spoon in 1916, the subject property passed to Louis F. Bambauer in 1920.

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes**: (List attributes and codes)

**B12. References**:

**B13. Remarks**:  

**B14. Evaluator**: Kent Seavey  
**Date of Evaluation**: July 26, 2018

**Sketch Map with north arrow required.**

(This space reserved for official comments.)

**Required information**
P3 (cont.). As originally constructed in 1923, the brick facade had a one-car arched entry, that was widened after 1930, and a large exit opening about halfway along the building envelope on Laurel Ave. that was enclosed sometime c 1970. The commercial building is sited on the north side of Laurel Ave. between Forest Ave. and 16th St. across from City Hall, with mature street trees screening part of the Laurel Ave. elevation. It is located in an active commercial district with retail shops, businesses and public offices of varying ages, sizes and styles.

Character-defining features include its rectangular plan, concrete construction; enframed window wall facade, with decorative brick work; pedimented parapet roof; and large, multi-paned showroom type windows.

B10 (cont.) Louis F. Bamhauer (1872-1946), came to Pacific Grove in 1915 from Los Banos, where he had been a blacksmith and stock raiser before going into the automotive business. He would later serve a term as a Pacific Grove City Trustee. Little is known of his architect, Paul V. Tuttle (1881-1885), who first appears in Pacific Grove in 1916, having come from Southern California where he may have been involved in the design of two Carnegie Libraries, in Glendale and Huntington Beach. Tuttle was affiliated with the Del Monte Improvement Co. in 1919 in a venture to develop "A miniature Coney Island at Del Monte" by extending the existing pier, building a new bathhouse and adding two hundred cottages and other improvements. Both of his Libraries in Southern California were described as "Classical Revival" in style, which may explain the classical detailing of the brick facade on the City Hall Garage. Tuttle moved to Oakland in 1922, briefly retaining a branch office in Pacific Grove. Of interest, contractor for the City Hall Garage, William P. Sweeney (1862-1952) who came to Pacific Grove in 1905, was a carpenter employed by the Hotel Del Monte when architect Tuttle was in discussion about the Coney Island project. Contractor Sweeney also built the local high school gymnasium, Grove Theater and the Sprouse Reitz Store, on Lighthouse Avenue. In November of 1928 Mary Hoffman, and her son Harold Hoffman (1897-1977) purchased the City Hall Garage from the Bamhauer family through a trade for some Lassen County property owned by the Bamhauers. Harold Hoffman would operate the auto repair and sales business from that date to 1967. Based on the then advent of the Great Depression in 1929-1930, it is probable that Hoffman enlarged the Forest Ave. entry by 1930.

Beverly Fabrics occupied the property in late 1969, initiating the exterior changes noted by the building permits identified in B6 of the BSO above. Signage was added in 1979 and 1991, but since removed by the new owners in the later 1990s, as well as the reopening some historic windows along Laurel Ave. that had been enclosed.

The design of the Modern Broad-Front commercial building was a double-width storefront, made possible in the first quarter of the twentieth century by the introduction of new materials, chiefly reinforced concrete with steel beams and columns. This made possible one wide storefront twice as deep as it was wide. The facade design tended to reinforce the openness of the building’s face. Thick piers anchored the edges, holding a brick panel that was usually subdivided. Display windows were partitioned into panels of glass between mullions, which helped broaden the front, and were topped by a series of small transom windows, as seen in the subject property. Ornamentation was simple, with brickwork or terra cotta panels, or copings around the edges. The design type, also referred to as an enframed window wall, was visually unified by enframing the large center section with a wide, often continuous boarder, which was treated as a single compositional unit. The City Hall Garage is a particularly interesting example for its excellent classically derived ornamental brickwork detailing by architect Tuttle, with a simple architrave carved on engaged columns supporting a corbeled coping below a wide frieze, capped by a narrow corona. The simple pedimented parapet crowns the ensemble.

In spite of changes over time, the subject property retains sufficient historic significance and physical integrity to be listed in the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory, at the local level of significance, as a good representative example of Automotive related commercial architecture under the theme of Pacific Grove Comes of Age (1903-1927) in the 2011 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement. Its period of significance is 1923-1967.

B12 (cont.)


Monterey County Assessor’s records, Mo. Co, Assessor’s office, Salinas.


Pacific Grove Planning Department, building records for 246 Forest Ave.


Tuttle, Paul V., Archival information in the Monterey Area Architectural Resources Archives (MAARA), Monterey.
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS
FOR REHABILITATION

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

8. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
EXISTING BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B UNIT</th>
<th>NT 14,413 SQ. FT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E TOTAL PAVING COV.:</td>
<td>11,413 SQ. FT. = 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N FIRST FLOOR</th>
<th>11,413 SQ. FT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 1:</td>
<td>1,471 SQ. FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT 2:</td>
<td>1,942 SQ. FT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N SECOND FLOOR TOTAL | 2,849 SQ. FT. |

| N GROSS FLOOR AREA (GFA) | 14,413 SQ. FT. = 100% |
| (N) BUILDING LOT COVERAGE: | 11,413 SQ. FT. = 100% |

| N TOTAL SITE COV.: | 11,413 SQ. FT. = 100% |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
EXISTING 1 STORY UNIT TO BE REMODELED. 1 PARKING GARAGE TO BE ADDED FOR THE NEW SECOND STORY UNIT AT THE LOCATION OF THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY CUT AND BUILDING OPENING. FIRE EGRESS TO BE ADDED TO EACH UNIT. EACH WITH A ROOF DECK. NEW MATERIALS TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS.

EXISTING ROOF, WALLS, AND WINDOWS TO REMAIN BEYOND AREA OF WORK.
EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN
GROVE MARKET

OUTLINE

9'-4" HDR.

(N) STUCCO SIDING TO MATCH EXISTING ALUM. CLAD CORNER WINDOW W/ STUCCO MOLD SILL AND TRIM.

(E) STUCCO SIDING ALUM. CLAD WOOD WINDOWS W STUCCO MOLD TRIM AND SILLS, TYP.

6X4 PLASTER TRIM W/ 4X10 PLASTER TRIM BELOW.

(N) ROLL UP GARAGE DOORS

(N) FRONT ENTRY WITH STUCCO MOLD TRIM

FIRST FLOOR 0'-0" F.F.
SECOND FLOOR +12'-0" T.P.
SECOND FLOOR +1'-2" F.F.

VAULTED CEILING AT LIVING AND DINING ROOMS.

TYP. 8' TOP PLATE OTHER AREAS.

PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

EXISTING WEST ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

REMODEL AND ADDITION FOR:
MUM'S PLACE
PACIFIC GROVE, CA 93950

246 FOREST AVE.

JEANNE C. BYRNE, FAIA
ARCHITECTS
591 LIGHTHOUSE AVE., SUITE #5
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950

PAS
JOB NUMBER
DRAWN BY
OF      SHEETS
NO. C12817
RENEWED 03-30-19
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EXISTING EAST ELEVATION

PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION

PROPOSED EAST SECTION
FLAT ROOF AT 2ND FL. W/ PERIMETER PARAPET

2X6 STUDS @ 16" O.C., TYP. W/ 1/2" THIN-WALL BOARD @ INTERIOR, TYP.

3-COAT STUCCO OVER 2-LAYERS BLDG. PAPER AND WIRE MESH OVER PLYWD.

2X FACIA W/ SQUARE STAINLESS STEEL GUTTERS, TYP. NOTCH FACIA FOR STUCCO MOLDING.

5/8" THIN-WALL BOARD @ CEILING, TYP.

USE R-30 SPRAY-ON FOAM INSULATION AT ROOF SHEATHING.
NO VENTILATION REQUIRED.

MICROLLAM JOISTS TRIMMED FOR DECK SLOPE OF 1/4":12".
BLOCKING BETWEEN JOISTS AS SHOWN FOR NAILING.

2X PAINTED TRIM OVER RIM BD W/ DRIP EDGE STAINLESS STEEL FLASHING AT DECK. COUNTER FLASHING KIRF INTO POST, TYP.

BITUTHANE OVER PLYWOOD, EXTEND 4" UP POST, 6" UP WALL.
THIN-SET W/ "HARDI-BACKER", THIN-SET W/ STONE/TILE FINISH.

STAINLESS FRAME SYSTEM FOR GLASS PANELS. SECURE POSTS TO WALL CAP/FRAMING PER MANUF. SPECS.

1/2" CLR. TEMPERED GLASS PANELS. 1" SPACE TO ALL FRAMING. SECURE W/ GLASS CLAMPS AT POSTS PER MANUF SPECS.

STAINLESS STEEL TOP RAIL AS REQ. PER CODE. USE SMALLEST PROFILE ALLOWED.

FOR FLOOR FRAMING SEE STRUCTURAL DWGS

PAINTED 6X4 ANGLED WATER TABLE W/ 4X10 BELLY BAND BELOW

R-19 BATT INSUL., TYP., U.O.N.

STAINLESS STEEL FLASHING AS REQ.
MIN. 6" UP WALL, TYP.

VINYL WHEEP SCREEDS
GRADE D BLDG. PAPER & CORNERS, TYP.

MTL. LATH O/ 2-LAYERS 3-COAT STUCCO FINISH O/
SEDONA COLLECTION

Sedona Collection

Standard Features

AAMA 2604 specifications. AAMA 2605 finishes are available upon request. Multiple exterior clad colors can be used in single units to suit any architectural or aesthetic design.

1. Extruded aluminum frame corners are sealed with silicone, corner keys, pads and secured with screws.

2. A continuous extruded aluminum nailing flange is an integral part of the frame extrusion - stout and watertight.

3. The mitred corners of the nailing flange are sealed with factory-applied, butyl corner pads.

4. A factory-applied, extruded aluminum drip cap in matching color is standard with all products.

Glazing

8. Available in single or double pane configurations with double strength glass. Triple pane units are available in some sizes. Insulated units are 3/4" overall, separated by 1/2" TrueWARM® Edge structural silicone foam spacer from Quanex. All standard types of glass are available - from LoE to tints to specialty glazings - as is the capillary tube system for high altitude. The glass is dual bedded with a structural sealant and secured in the sash with a removable interior glazing bead.

Sash and Frame Interior

1. Sash and frame components are manufactured from kiln-dried, preservative-treated Douglas Fir in unfinished clear or distressed wood ready to prep for stain or paint. An optional factory-applied interior prime coat is available. Sedona Collection windows feature the Contemporary frame detail. The 1 3/4" thick Sedona sash is featured in our 2 1/4" Designer (Wide) sash.

2. All sash corners have mortise and tenon joints that are sealed and screwed.

Aluminum Clad Exterior

3. Exterior surfaces of both sash and frame are clad with .062" extruded aluminum (one of the thickest on the market) available in a palette of 60 colors in 6 industry-leading color collections, including 35 Heritage Collection Standard finishes, 4 Heritage Collection Textured finishes, 6 Weathered Collection finishes, 5 Metallic and 5 Pearl Metallic Collection finishes, 3 Anodized Collection finishes, 2 Industrial Series finishes and Custom Colors. Finishes meet

Wood Exterior

7. Exterior surfaces are available with either a factory-applied latex primer or in clear Douglas Fir. An optional distressed finish is available. All units with exterior trim (brickmould, stucco brickmould or S4S) feature factory-applied flexible flashing on sides and head.
Patio Sliding Door Standard Features

Frame and Panel Interior
1. Frame and panel components are manufactured from kiln-dried, preservative-treated Douglas Fir. Ponderosa Pine is an option for the interior. Other species are available by request. Interior surfaces are unfinished clear wood ready to prep for stain or paint. An optional factory-applied interior prime coat is available.

2. Panel stiles and rails are manufactured from 1 3/4" thick, kiln-dried, preservative-treated Douglas Fir. The top and bottom rails are solid material and engineered for additional strength and stability. The stiles on our operable panels are made of LVL material, while our fixed panels have engineered stiles. Panel stiles and rails are connected with heavy-duty 5/8" x 4" straight fluted dowels secured with exterior glue. Stiles and top rails are 4 5/8" wide. Bottom rails are 6 13/16" wide.

Aluminum Clad Exterior

Frame
3. All exposed exterior surfaces of our frame head and jambs are covered with .062" extruded aluminum (one of the thickest on the market) available in a palette of 60 colors in 6 industry-leading color collections, including 35 Heritage Collection Standard finishes, 4 Heritage Collection Textured finishes, 6 Weathered Collection finishes, 5 Metallic and 5 Pearl Metallic Collection finishes, 3 Anodized Collection finishes, 2 Industrial Series finishes and Custom Colors. Finishes meet AAMA 2604 specifications. AAMA 2605 finishes are available upon request. Multiple exterior clad colors can be used in single units to suit any architectural or aesthetic design.

4. Extruded aluminum frame corners are sealed with silicone and foam pads and mechanically fastened. Specially designed, glass-filled nylon sill plugs at the bottom corners afford excellent moisture protection for the side jambs.

A continuous extruded aluminum nailing flange is an integral part of the frame extrusion – stout and watertight.

The exterior of the frame clad is designed to accept retrofit trim systems or clad brickmould.

Panel
5. Panels are covered with .075" extruded aluminum (one of the thickest on the market) available in our extensive color palette.

Wood Exterior

Frame
6. Frame components are manufactured from kiln-dried, preservative-treated Douglas Fir. Exterior surfaces are available with either a factory-applied latex primer or in clear Douglas Fir. All units with exterior trim (brickmould, stucco brickmould or S4S) feature factory-applied flexible flashing on sides and head.
SIMPSON DOOR COMPANY OR
SIMILAR, RESIDENTIAL
ENTRY DOORS @ 16TH ST.
SUMMIT GARAGE DOOR OR SIM.
Mission MB-6

sku#: MB-6

6" Mission Wall Mount

Dimensions: 6"W x 10.375"H x 9.5"D

Extension:

Canopy/Back Plate Dimensions: 4" x 8"

Mounting Center to Top: 4.125"

Bulb Type: 1-100W Medium (not included)

Safety Rating: Suitable for Damp Locations

Finish Shown: Rustic Brown

Ships Via: Small Parcel

Arroyo Craftsman 4509 Littlejohn Street, Baldwin Park, CA 91706

626-960-9411 | arroyo-info@framburg.com (mailto:arroyo-info@framburg.com)
TO: Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board

FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner

MEETING DATE: February 12, 2019

PERMIT APPLICATION NO.: Architectural Permit (AP) Application No. 18-0946

LOCATION: 945 Jewell Ave. Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-131-005)

SUBJECT: An 808 sq. ft. addition to the rear of an existing 1,080 sq. ft. single-story residence. The ± 11,740 sq. ft. parcel is developed with a detached one-car garage, a small shed, and several trees, all of which will remain. All development standards of the R-1 zoning district will be met.

APPLICANT: Mr. and Mrs. Paul Ratto (Owners)

ZONING/LAND USE: Residential Single-Family (R-1) / Residential Medium Density, up to 17.4 dwelling units per acre (RM)

CEQA: Categorical Exemption, Sections 15301(e) and 15331, Additions and Historic Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation, respectively

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the project subject to the recommended findings, conditions, and Sections 15301(e) and 15331 CEQA exemptions for Additions and Historic Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation, respectively.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
An 808 sq. ft. addition to the rear of an existing 1,080 sq. ft. single-story residence. The ± 11,740 sq. ft. parcel is developed with a detached one-car garage, a small shed, and several trees, all of which will remain. All development standards of the R-1 zoning district will be met. No tree removal is proposed.

BACKGROUND
Site Description
The approximately 11,740 sq. ft. property is currently developed with a 1,080 sq. ft. single-story, single-family residence and detached one-car garage and 120 sq. ft. shed. There are a variety of trees on the property, including a 34” diameter palm tree, all of which will remain.
Surrounding Land Uses
The property is located in a neighborhood that consists of large-lot, single-family residential development. The neighborhood consists of fairly narrow streets without sidewalks. The construction of in-fill sidewalk is not required for this project.

DISCUSSION
Applicable General Plan Policies
The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and policies that call for the orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. This residential project helps the City achieve several of its housing goals as stated in the General Plan and is in compliance with the Residential Medium Density land use designation.

Applicable Zoning Code Regulations
General Plan policies are implemented through the R-1 zoning district which allows single-family residential development and accessory structures and uses in areas with adequate public services.

The proposed project is in full compliance with the zoning regulations set forth in PGMC 23.16. This includes and is not limited to the height limit, setback requirements, gross floor area and allowable site coverage. The project is also in compliance with the parking standards for single-family residential development in PGMC Section 23.16.070 which requires one covered and one uncovered parking spaces. The existing residence provides a one-car garage and space for one additional vehicle in the driveway. Note that the existing garage and shed are nonconforming in terms of side yard setback; no change is proposed to these structures at this time.

Architecture and Design Considerations
The proposed addition to the rear of the existing residence will be nominally visible from the street and will include stucco and wood trim finishes that complement the existing residence. The Phase II Historic Assessment (Attachment C) identifies the following character defining features of the Tudor Revival style, several of which the subject property contains:

- Rectangular massing with asymmetrical facades
- Steeply pitched gable roofs, usually in combination of side and front-facing gables
- Shallow eaves or eaveless
- Stucco cladding, smooth or textured
- Arched entries, sometimes set within gabled porch elements
- Rusticated masonry accents around doors and windows
- Vertical attic vents in the gable end, sometimes with arched tops
- Exterior chimney, sometimes with decorative brickwork

By focusing the alterations on the rear of the house, the majority of the character defining features and the front elevation visible from the street will remain unchanged. In addition to creating an addition that is sensitive to the historic nature of the residence, the design utilizes the following Architectural Design Guidelines:
Guideline #1 – The mass and height of a new building should blend well with neighboring structures and not overwhelm them with disproportionate size or a design that is out of character.

Although the project consists of a relatively small addition rather than a new building, its size and design are in character with the existing residence and other residences in the vicinity.

Guideline #2 – Roof lines of new structures should be compatible with the pitch and character of roofs seen traditionally in the neighborhood.

The addition includes a low gable-end roof on the rear elevation, a portion of which will be visible from the street. The addition will have a finish height of 14’9”; the existing house is 19’5” tall.

Guideline Nos. 10 through 12 – Lighting shall be down-shielded, low-level, unobtrusive and of a style that is compatible with the architectural style of the building.

The proposed exterior lighting will be at doors and at two locations on the west side only. The style of wall-mounted bronze and glass light appears to be compatible with the house.

Guideline # 21 – The design and siting of a dwelling should take into consideration all existing trees in order to avoid unneeded cutting and trimming.

There are several trees identified on the site plan all of which are proposed to be retained. The 34” palm and others along the west property line will be protected during excavation and construction as needed.

Guideline #28 – An addition should complement and balance the overall form, mass, and composition of the existing building.

The proposed 808 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the house will be only nominally visible from the street and will be in balance with the overall form and mass given its lower height, similar finish materials and siting on the property.

Guideline #33 – Door and window proportions should relate to the scale and style of the building itself.

According to the Phase II Historic Assessment (PAST Consulting, December 2018), only one casement window on the west elevation and the garage door have been replaced over the years. The new windows and doors will be of a similar scale and style with true divided lights and quality bronze-colored aluminum clad framing. New windows will be a combination of casement, horizontal slider and vertical double-hung styles.

Stormwater Treatment Measure
At ± 945 sq. ft. of new impervious surface, the project does not trigger stormwater requirements.

Water
Water availability must be established prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the proposed bathroom. If water is not available, the property will be added to the City’s water wait list.
Cultural & Historic Resources
The property is not on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). A Phase I Historical Assessment (PAST Consulting, 2014) was prepared for a previous project and resulted in a finding of eligibility for the HRI. Consequently, a Phase II Assessment was prepared for the current project (PAST Consulting, Dec. 2018) which analyzed the proposed addition and found the project to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and that the Class 31, Section 15331, CEQA exemption for historic resources is applicable.

Several Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance reports have been prepared for properties in the immediate vicinity which resulted in the recommendation of adding the standard inadvertent discovery protocol language to the conditions of approval. This recommendation is included in the Conditions of Approval (Attachment B).

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)
In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemptions, Section 15301(e) and 15331 for Additions to Existing Facilities and Historic Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation, respectively.

The Class 1, Section 15301(e) exemption allows for additions to existing facilities and the Class 31, Section 15331 exemption allows work to occur on historic resources that is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. A qualified architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards to prepare such recommendations has verified that the proposed project will not significantly affect the resource and that the Class 31 exemption is appropriate.

Neither the Class 1 nor the Class 31 exemptions are subject to exceptions under 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines pertaining to location, cumulative impacts, significant effects, scenic highways, hazardous waste sites, and historical resources. Staff finds that none of these exceptions applies and that the proposed project qualifies for the Class 3 exemption.

FINDINGS
Staff recommends if AP 18-0946 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended findings (see Attachment B, Draft Permit).

CONDITIONS
Staff recommends if AP 18-0946 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended conditions (see Attachment B, Draft Permit).

ATTACHMENTS
   A. Application
   B. Draft Permit
   C. Phase II Historic Assessment
   D. Project Data Sheet
   E. Materials Sample Sheet
   F. Site Plan & Elevations
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd
 Permit Application
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Project Address: 945 Jewell Ave.  
APN: 006-131-005

| Project Description: |  
(N) 800 sq. ft. addition to rear of residence (1-story)  
(N) 25 sq. ft. covered entry porch  
(N) 18 L.F. of retaining wall to rear of residence |

Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface?  
☑ Yes  ☐ No

Will the project impact any tree(s) on site?  
☐ Yes  ☑ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Name: Aaron Tolletto  
Phone: (831) 578-3450  
Email: aaron.tolley@sbcglobal.net  
Mailing Address: 957 Angelus Way, Del Rey Oaks, CA 93940 | Name: Mr. & Mrs. Paul Ratto  
Phone: (925) 899-9536  
Email:  
Mailing Address: 945 Jewell Ave., Pacific Grove, CA 93950 |

Permit Request:
☐ CRD: Counter Determination  
☐ AP: Architectural Permit  
☐ AAP: Administrative AP  
☐ ADC: Arch Design Change  
☐ ASP: Admin Sign Permit  
☐ SP: Sign Permit  
☐ UP: Use Permit  
☐ AUP: Administrative UP  
☐ ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit  
☐ LLA: Lot Line Adjustment  
☐ IHS: Initial Historic Screening  
☐ HPP: Historic Preservation  
☐ A: Appeal  
☐ TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't  
☐ EIR: Environmental Impact  
☐ VAR: Variance  
☐ MMP: Mitigation Monitoring  
☐ Stormwater Permit  
☐ Other:  
☐ Other:  

CEQA Determination:  
☐ Exempt  
☐ Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration  
☐ Environmental Impact Report

Review Authority:  
☐ Staff  ☑ HRC  
☐ ZA  ☐ PC  
☐ SPRC  ☐ CC  
☐ ARB  ☐  

Active Permits:  
☐ Active Planning Permit  
☐ Active Building Permit  
☐ Active Code Violation Permit:  

Overlay Zones:  
☐ Butterfly Zone  
☐ Coastal Zone  
☐ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)  
☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHIA)

Property Information  
Lot: 5  
Block: 307  
GP:  
Tract:  
PG Acres:  
Lot Size: 11,734

☐ Historic Resources Inventory  
☑ Archaeologically Sensitive Area

Staff Use Only:
Received by: AD  
Assigned to:  

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE  
COMMUNITY DEV DEPT

PAID
3,584.90

NOV 08 2018
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INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively “Indemnitees”), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnitees by reason of the City’s processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney’s fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City’s right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant’s inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City’s duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City’s misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: ____________________________ Date: 9/11/18

Owner Signature (Required): _____________________ Date: 9/11/18
### Planning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25% of base permit fee or $1,000 whichever is greater plus noticing costs

| Other                                        |        |         |

### Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>5% of Permit Fee</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Update Fee</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$146.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption Fee</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Buffer Zone</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>25% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Special Biological Significance</td>
<td>5% of Permit Fee</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$146.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area</td>
<td>15% of Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Mailings</td>
<td>$0.48 * (# of Mailings)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing – Herald Ad</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County filing fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File maintenance fee</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>$51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fees: $3,584.90

Page 80 of 239
ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AP) 18-0946
FOR AN 808 SQ. FT. ADDITION TO THE REAR OF AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 945 Jewell Avenue, Pacific Grove (APN 006-131-005)
2. The subject site has a designation of Residential Medium Density (RM) on the adopted City of Pacific Grove General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Residential Single-Family (R-1) zoning district.
4. The subject site is approximately 11,740 square feet in size.
5. The subject site is developed with a 1,080 sq. ft. single-story residence with a detached one car garage, a small shed and several trees, all of which will remain.
6. The subject site is located in the Area of Special Biological Significance and the Archaeological Zone, but not in the Coastal zone or other sensitive areas.
7. The property is not on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). A Phase I Historical Assessment (PAST Consulting, 2014) was prepared for a previous project and resulted in a finding of eligibility for the HRI. Consequently, a Phase II Assessment was prepared for the current project (PAST Consulting, Dec. 2018) which analyzed the proposed addition and found the project to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and that the Class 31, Section 15331, CEQA exemption for historic resources is applicable.
8. Several Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance reports have been prepared for properties surrounding the subject property which resulted in the recommendation of adding the standard inadvertent discovery protocol language to the conditions of approval. This recommendation is included herein.
9. This project has been determined to be CEQA Exempt under CEQA Guidelines, Class 1, Section 15301(e), Additions, and Class 31, Section 15331, Historic Resources Restoration/Rehabilitation.

FINDINGS for Architectural Permits
Per PGMC Section 23.70.060(f):
(1) The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood; and
(2) The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
(3) The board has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review guidelines in making its determinations on single-family residences.

The proposed addition to the ca. 1928 Tudor Revival style house incorporates the following Architectural Review Guidelines which are further described in the Agenda Report: #1, #2, #21, #28, and #33.

The proposed addition to the rear of the existing house will result in a size and layout that is consistent with residential structures typically found in single-family residential neighborhoods. The project complies with the requirements of the general plan and zoning code; will not be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and the addition will preserve the front elevation, all of the character-defining features identified in the Phase II but two rear windows and will be of a scale that will be compatible with the existing residence.
PERMIT

Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0946: An 808 sq. ft. addition to the rear of an existing 1,080 sq. ft. single-story residence. The ± 11,740 sq. ft. parcel is developed with a detached one-car garage, a small shed, and several trees, all of which will remain. All development standards of the R-1 zoning district will be met. No tree removal is proposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. **Permit Expiration.** This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.

2. **Construction Compliance.** All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require ARB approval.

3. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community and Economic Development (CEDD) Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

4. **Public Works, Fire and Building.** Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit.

5. **Conformance to Plans.** Development of the site shall conform to the approved AP 18-0946 plans entitled Ratto Residence and received by the CEDD on December 13, 2018, on file with the CEDD. All construction plans must be in conformance to the Building Code.

6. **Water.** Evidence of adequate potable water shall be provided prior to the issuance of Building Permit(s). If water is not available, the property shall be added to the water wait list.

7. **Archaeological Resources.** As recommended in the Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance (Archaeological Consulting, June 2009):

   If archaeological resources or human remains are accidentally discovered during construction, work shall be halted within 50 meters (150 feet) of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.

8. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

9. **Exterior Lighting.** All exterior lighting fixtures shall conform to Architectural Review Guidelines #10-12.

10. **Tree Protection Standards During Construction.** Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapters 12.20 and 12.30, and the Urban Forestry Standards, all trees that are otherwise protected and will be impacted as a result of Development, both proposed for pruning or removal and where the development will impact the critical root zone of the tree are protected. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the Project Arborist shall review grading, drainage, utility, building and landscape plans to determine impacts to individual Trees, to determine required minimum Tree protection standards during construction and submit a report to the City Arborist for review and approval.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:

1. The Board determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Board authorizes Approval of Architectural Permit (AP) 18-0946 as conditioned and pursuant to Classes 1 and 31, CEQA categorical exemptions for Additions and Historic Resources Rehabilitation/ Restoration, respectively.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE 12th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:

APPROVED:

Sarah Boyle, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

Mr. and Mrs. Paul Ratto, owner(s)  Date
945 JEWELL AVE., PACIFIC GROVE, CA
PHASE TWO HISTORIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

Applicant:
Paul Ratto, Owner
945 Jewell Ave.
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Consultant:
PAST Consultants, LLC
P.O. Box 721
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

December 12, 2018

PAST
CONSULTANTS LLC
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   Appendix A: State of California, DPR523 Forms
1.0 INTRODUCTION

PAST Consultants, LLC (PAST) presents this Phase Two Historic Assessment Report for the property located at 945 Jewell Avenue, in Pacific Grove, California (APN 006-131-005). In November 2018 PAST was contracted to evaluate proposed alterations to the subject property to ensure that the proposed changes would comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

PAST conducted site visits to the subject property in December 2018 to photograph the property and assess its existing conditions. With the exception of a permit-approved storage shed constructed behind the garage, the property has not been altered since the initial Phase One inspection by PAST in 2014.

Property Description

The subject property contains a single-family residence and garage (circa-1928) constructed in the Tudor Revival Style. The current residential use of the property is the same as its historic use. Presently, the property is not on the National or California Registers; nor is it on the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory (HRI).

PAST evaluated the property in 2014 and determined that the subject property is eligible for the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory under criteria a, d, i and j of the HRI. According to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, the house is a representative property type illustrating the theme, “City of Homes (1927 – 1945),” and maintains nearly all of its historic character defining features. The completed DPR523 forms are provided in Appendix A of this report.

Project Team

Client
Paul Ratto
945 Jewell Ave.
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Designer/Applicant
AST Design Group
957 Angelus Way
Del Rey Oaks, CA 93940
Principal Architect: Aaron Tollefson

Regulatory Agency
City of Pacific Grove Planning Division
300 Forest Ave., 2nd Floor
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Historic Preservation Consultant
PAST Consultants, LLC
P.O. Box 721
Pacific Grove, California 93950
Architectural Historian: Seth Bergstein

Principal Seth Bergstein meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History and History
PAST Consultants, LLC: Firm Qualifications

Seth A. Bergstein, Principal of PAST Consultants, LLC, began his technical career as a civil, structural and geotechnical engineer for a variety of commercial and transportation engineering projects. This experience created an appreciation for historic engineering and architectural structures and led him to architectural study at the University of Oregon, Eugene, and a Master of Arts in Historic Preservation from Cornell University. After Cornell, Seth was a project manager, materials conservator and architectural historian for Architectural Resources Group (ARG) and managed projects for a diverse range of historic building types, including the Point Reyes Lighthouse, Bernard Maybeck’s First Church of Christ, Scientist, Pasadena City Hall, the John Muir House, and a number of historic bridges, including project management for the restoration of the Wawona Covered Bridge in Yosemite National Park.

In 2004, Seth founded PAST Consultants, LLC (PAST), a historic preservation consulting firm specializing in preservation planning, documentation, and conservation for historic and cultural resources. PAST’s clients include the State of California, public agencies, architectural and engineering firms, museums, nonprofit organizations, preservation advocates and private property owners. PAST is represented on the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) list of qualified historic consultants sponsored by the California Office of Historic Preservation and is on numerous certified consultants lists for public agencies throughout California.

PAST has prepared numerous successful National Register nominations, written historic context statements for public agencies, photo-documented historic buildings for HABS/HAER projects, prepared historic structure reports and evaluated numerous historic buildings throughout central and northern California for both public and private clients. PAST is often hired to evaluate proposed changes to historic buildings for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. PAST is presently the on-call historic preservation consultant for the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea.

Principal Seth A. Bergstein has nearly 30 years combined experience in civil and structural engineering, materials conservation, architectural history and historic preservation planning. Seth meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History and History. He has written articles on historic contexts and the preparation of historic context statements, spoken at preservation conferences and led architectural tours. In 2015 he was the keynote speaker at the Western Association for Art Conservation’s annual conference, held at the Asilomar Conference Grounds in Pacific Grove.

Methodology

Site Visits

PAST conducted multiple site visits to the subject property in 2014 for preparation of the DPR523 forms (see Appendix). In December 2018, PAST attended site visits to the subject property to discuss the proposed alterations to the subject residence, to aid in design that would
meet the *Secretary of the Interior’s Rehabilitation Standards*, and to assess the property for material changes to the subject residence that may have occurred since the 2014 assessment. The subject property has not changed since the 2014 assessment, with the exception of a storage shed located behind the garage, which was approved by the City of Pacific Grove’s Planning Department in 2018.

Following the December 2018 site visit, revised plans from the project were received on December 10, 2018.

**Research Design**

PAST performed research in local and regional repositories to develop this historic assessment report:

- Monterey County Assessor’s Office, Salinas, CA
- City of Pacific Grove Planning Division, Pacific Grove, CA
- The Heritage Society of Pacific Grove, Pacific Grove, CA
- Pacific Grove Public Library, Pacific Grove, CA
- California History Room, Monterey Public Library, Monterey, CA

**Registration**

The property is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. PAST evaluated the property in 2014 and determined that the subject property is eligible for the Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory under criteria a, d, i and j of the HRI. According to the *City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement*, the house is a representative property type illustrating the theme, “City of Homes (1927 – 1945),” and maintains nearly all of its historic character defining features. The completed DPR523 forms are provided in Appendix A of this report.

**Proposed Project**

Drawings from AST Design Group dated December 10, 2018 were the drawings evaluated for this Phase Two Historic Assessment Report. A gable-roofed, rear addition of 808 sf to the existing house is the proposed scope of work for this project.

**Report Format**

The next section, *Chapter 2.0: Historical Background*, describes the historical development of the subject property. The subject house’s physical description and list of the historic character defining features are described in *Chapter 3.0: Description of the Historic Resource*. *Chapter 4.0: Evaluation of Historic Significance* evaluates the house on the subject property for National Register- and California Register-eligibility and the City of Pacific Grove HRI criteria. *Chapter 5.0: Impacts of the Proposed Project* describes how the project will affect the existing property.
and evaluates the proposed alterations for conformance with the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Chapter 6.0: Mitigation states the adequacy of mitigation for the subject project. Chapter 7.0: Bibliography lists the literature cited for this project. Lastly, *Appendix A* provides the DPR523 forms prepared in 2014 for the subject property.
2.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The location of the property is 945 Jewell Avenue in Pacific Grove, CA (Figure 1).

![Location of the subject property](image)

Figure 1. Location of the subject property (Courtesy: Google Maps).

The subject property is located in the Fairway Homes Subdivision. According to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement:

… the Fairway Homes subdivision was associated with the development of the city’s golf course, constructed on land donated by Del Monte Properties. The subdivision was recorded in 1932, and comprised primarily of areas along Jewell, Bay View and Foam avenues, as well as areas adjacent to the Beach Tract. It is unclear how many speculative homes were built by Del Monte Properties, but the number was likely small. More commonly, the company could provide buyers with various standardized architectural plans, or coordinate custom designs through architects that were kept on retainer. A brochure issued circa 1928 states that the company was affiliated with an “up to the
minute architectural and building department” so that “every idea of yours may be incorporated in any plan you decide upon.¹

Although the subdivision was recorded in 1932, homes were being constructed in the late 1920s in various period-revival styles. The subject property represents an example of this earlier construction, rendered in the Tudor Revival style.

Ownership History

A building permit for the house’s construction was issued to Ethel P. Young in 1926. Documentation from the Heritage Society of Pacific Grove indicates the year built as 1928. Based on this information, a circa-1928 construction date is chosen for the house and garage. City directories (Polk’s Monterey, Pacific Grove and Carmel 1930 – 1965) do not list Ethel P. Young as occupying the house. The first residents listed in the house and continuing until 1965 are John Jay and Lona Harris, Jr. John J. Harris, Jr. worked at the First National Bank of Monterey and eventually became the Bank’s Vice President. His wife, Lona Harris, worked as a clerk for Pease Prescription Pharmacy in Monterey. John J. Harris, Jr. (1899-1963) died in 1963, but his wife remained at the house.² Research did not reveal any significant contributions from John J. Harris, Jr. or Lona Harris to national, California or Pacific Grove history.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCE

945 Jewell Ave. contains a single-story residence and garage (circa-1928) constructed in the Tudor Revival Style. The house features steeply-pitched, cross-gabled roofs finished with eaves that project below the wall plate level. A prominent street-facing gable contains paired casement windows and false half-timbering. The cross gable on the front elevation contains banked wood casement windows and an original entry door. Stucco finishes the exterior walls; irregular wood shakes finish the roof. A driveway leading to a detached garage runs along the east end of the property (Figures 2 - 5).

Figures 2 and 3. Left image shows the front (north) elevation and garage. Right image details the left side (east) elevation and garage.

Figures 4 and 5. Left image shows the rear (south) elevation. Right image details the garage’s side and rear elevations.
Building Chronology

Research in the City of Pacific Grove Planning Department and Heritage Society files reveal few permits to date the alterations; however, the property is largely unchanged from its original construction. An aluminum slider window replacement to the right side (west) elevation was installed at an unknown date. The window replacement removed a pair of period wood-casement windows from the west elevation. The original garage door has been replaced at an unknown date.

Character Defining Features

Character defining features are the building qualities, details, construction methods and materials that highlight the historic fabric of a building. For a building to maintain historic integrity, most of its character defining features must remain extant. The subject property is in largely original condition and possesses nearly all of its historic character defining features.

According to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, the character-defining features of the Tudor Revival style are:

- Rectangular massing with asymmetrical facades.
- Steeply-pitched gable roofs, usually in combination of side and front-facing gables.
- Shallow eaves or eaveless.
- Stucco cladding, smooth or textured.
- Arched entries, sometimes set within gabled porch elements.
- Rusticated masonry accents around doors and windows.
- Vertical attic vents in the gable end, sometimes with arched tops.
- Exterior chimney, sometimes with decorative brickwork.³

945 Jewell Ave. maintains these character-defining features because little alterations have occurred. An original casement window was removed on the right side (west) elevation; and the garage door has been replaced. Aside from these changes, the house and garage are essentially intact. The house maintains sufficient historic integrity to communicate its Tudor Revival style.

³ City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, 222.
4.0 EVALUATION OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

National Register and California Register Significance

The National (NR) and California (CR) registers have the same four-part criteria. The criteria break down into Association with an event (NR - A; CR – 1); Association with an important person (NR - B; CR – 2); Association with architectural and/or construction method (NR - C; CR – 3); and Information potential (NR - D; CR – 4).

Given the disturbed nature of the site and development of the area, the subject property does not qualify under the fourth criterion, archaeological/informational potential (NR - D; CR – 4). The following evaluates the subject property under the remaining three criteria:

**Event: National Register- Criterion A/ California Register-Criterion 1.**
Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

*The subject property is not eligible under this Criterion, as no specific event led to its development. The incorporation of the Fairway Homes Subdivision in 1932 postdates the house’s construction; however, it is likely that period-revival styles were available for designs by the late 1920s, as stated in the Historic Context Statement. The development of a subdivision is too general an event for a National Register-association, unless the subdivision was developed at the same time, represents the rise of suburbanization, or possesses sufficient historic integrity as a grouping of buildings. The Fairway Homes subdivision contains a disparate group of building styles, dating from the 1920s to modern construction and would likely not qualify as a National- or California-register eligible district.*

**Important Person: National Register Criterion B/California Register-Criterion 2.**
Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.

*The first residents listed as residing in the house and continuing until 1965 are John Jay and Lona Harris, Jr. John J. Harris, Jr. worked at the First National Bank of Monterey and eventually became the Bank’s Vice President. His wife, Lona Harris, worked as a clerk for Pease Prescription Pharmacy in Monterey. John J. Harris, Jr. (1899-1963) died in 1963, but his wife remained at the house. Research did not reveal any significant contributions from John J. Harris, Jr. or Lona Harris to national, California or Pacific Grove history. The property is not eligible under this Criterion.*

**Architectural Design: National Register Criterion C/California Register-Criterion 3.**
Architectural design/construction method or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.

*The subject house does represent an intact example of a local variant of the Tudor Revival Style. However, this would likely not raise this house to National-register eligibility under this Criterion given the number of better examples of this house style that can be found throughout*
California and the United States. A local designation is more appropriate for this more typical example of the Tudor Revival style.

City of Pacific Grove Historic Resources Inventory

The eligibility criteria for local listing in the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) are described in the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code §23.76.025) as follows:

a. Whether the structure has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city of Pacific Grove, the state of California, or the United States;
b. Whether it is the site of a significant historic event;
c. Whether it is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove;
d. Whether it is a particularly good example of a period or style;
e. Whether it is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pacific Grove possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;
f. Whether it is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city of Pacific Grove;
g. Whether it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation;
h. Whether it has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or of the city of Pacific Grove;
i. Whether it retains the integrity of the original design;
j. Whether it contributes to the architectural aesthetics and continuity of the street; and
k. Whether it is located within a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic properties which visually contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically.

945 Jewell Ave. satisfies items a, d, i and j of the City’s HRI. As an example of the Tudor Revival style, the house has significant character, interest and value as part of the development of Pacific Grove (a); is a particularly good example of the Tudor Revival style (d); retains the integrity of the original design (i); and contributes to the architectural aesthetics and continuity of the street (j). According to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement the house is a representative property type illustrating the theme, “City of Homes (1927 – 1945).” The house has sufficient historic integrity to communicate its Tudor Revival style and establish its local listing. The period of significance would be the date of the house’s construction, circa-1928.

The following evaluates the minimum eligibility requirements, according to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement:

Minimum Eligibility Requirements:
- Clear example of residential architecture from this period. Yes
- Retains original form and roofline. Yes
- Retains the original pattern of window and doors. Yes
- Retains original cladding (or the original cladding has been repaired/replaced in kind such that it substantially duplicates the original pattern). Yes
- Retains most of its original ornamentation, if applicable. Yes

Based on the above analysis, the subject house maintains all of its Minimum Eligibility Requirements to establish it as a representative property type in the Tudor Revival style.

**Historic Integrity Analysis**

The following lists the seven aspects of historic integrity with an analysis in italics:

1. **Location:** the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
   *The house is in its original location and maintains integrity of location.*

2. **Design:** the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
   *The house retains integrity of design because it is nearly intact, with few alterations, and maintains its historic character-defining features.*

3. **Setting:** the physical environment of a historic property.
   *The house remains in its original neighborhood setting of single-family homes and has integrity of setting.*

4. **Materials:** the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
   *The house maintains its half-timbering, roof massing and cladding materials. Although removal of original casement windows on the west elevation has occurred, the house retains sufficient integrity of materials.*

5. **Workmanship:** the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
   *Replacement of one set of paired casement windows and the garage door are minimal. The house maintains integrity of workmanship.*

6. **Feeling:** a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
   *The house retains enough character-defining features to retain integrity of feeling as a Tudor Revival-style residence.*

7. **Association:** the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.
   *The house retains enough character-defining features for it to be a representative property type under the City of Houses theme as described in the Historic Context Statement.*
5.0 IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

![Figure 6](image)

Figure 6. View of rear (south) elevation, with arrows showing the location of the proposed rear addition’s attachment to the existing residence. Two existing windows will be removed for the addition.

As stated in the Introduction, an 808-sf rear addition is proposed for this project. The addition’s massing is a low-pitched gable roof applied to the rear-building wall of the existing house’s west side. The rear addition will project 6’-8” out from the right side elevation’s building wall, but will be set back the entire distance of the side elevation’s building length.

Construction of the rear addition will remove two original wood-casement windows and stucco wall fabric from the rear elevation, as shown in Figure 6, above. It will not impact the two primary elevations: the front (north) and the left side (east) elevations. The following section presents the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (the Standards) and evaluates the proposed project for conformance with these standards.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (the Standards) provides the framework for evaluating the impacts of additions and alterations to historic buildings. The Standards describe four treatment approaches: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction. The Standards require that the treatment approach be determined first, as a different set of standards apply to each approach. For the proposed project, the treatment approach is rehabilitation. The Standards describe rehabilitation as:
In Rehabilitation, historic building materials and character-defining features are protected and maintained as they are in the treatment Preservation; however, an assumption is made prior to work that existing historic fabric has become damaged or deteriorated over time and, as a result, more repair and replacement will be required. Thus, latitude is given in the Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation to replace extensively deteriorated, damaged, or missing features using either traditional or substitute materials. Of the four treatments, only Rehabilitation includes an opportunity to make possible an efficient contemporary use through alterations and additions.4

The ten Standards for rehabilitation are:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

4 The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (accessed via http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/).
Evaluation of Proposed Alterations

The following lists the ten Standards for rehabilitation in italics, with an evaluation given below each Standard.

1. *A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*
   The proposed alterations will allow the building to keep its residential use, while retaining the existing character-defining features and satisfying this Standard.

2. *The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
   The proposed alterations remove two wood-casement windows and period stucco wall fabric from the rear building wall. The removal of these historic features are minimal and are located on the rear and least prominent elevation of the building. Examples of historic wood-casement windows and stucco wall fabric remain on the other three elevations. The spatial relationship between the house and garage will be maintained. For these reasons, the proposed alterations satisfy this Standard.

3. *Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.*
   The proposed alterations do not add conjectural features or elements from other historic properties that would confuse the remaining character-defining features of the subject property.

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*
   This Standard does not apply because no changes to the property have acquired historic significance.

5. *Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
   The proposed alterations remove minimal examples of period craftsmanship – two wood casement windows – and maintain the existing character defining features of the house, in keeping with this Standard.

6. *Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
   With the exceptions noted above, the proposed alterations will rehabilitate the remaining character-defining features of the house, in keeping with this Standard. Wood casement windows and trim will be repaired, rather than replaced. Existing stucco finishes on the primary elevation will be matched regarding stucco finish and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used. Physical treatments to repair existing wood windows and details will be undertaken with methods that do not impact the wood substrate. Deteriorated stucco finishes will be repaired with a treatment approach that does not damage the historic substrate.

8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken. This Standard does not apply, as archaeological features are not identified at the site.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed rear addition is a low-pitched gable roof with a roofline that is well below the existing roofline of the rear building mass. The rear addition projects 6'-8” from the right side elevation building wall; however, it will be barely visible from the street because it is set back the entire length of the right side elevation. A flat stucco wall finish and modern windows will be used on the rear addition to differentiate it from the original house. Since the rear addition removes a minimal amount of historic fabric, is set back a considerable distance from the street, is differentiated from the original house and is in scale and proportion to the existing house’s massing, the proposed building alterations meet this Standard.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed rear addition will likely not be reversed in the future; however, if it did occur, the original building walls could be repaired and the two period-casement windows could be fabricated and replaced. It should be noted that the proposed building alterations maintain sufficient historic character-defining features of the original house, allowing it to maintain adequate historic integrity and satisfy this Standard.
6.0 MITIGATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Because the proposed alterations to the building meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the alterations are considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource and do not constitute a substantial adverse change to the historic resource, thus conforming to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
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APPENDIX A: DPR523 FORMS

DPR523 forms for the subject property completed in 2014 by PAST Consultants, LLC
### PRIMARY RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>NRHP Status Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resource Name or #: (assigned by recorder) 945 Jewell Ave.

**P1. Other Identifier:**

**P2. Location:**
- **Not for Publication** ☐
- **Unrestricted** ☑
- **a. County:** Monterey
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** N/A
- **Date:** N/A
- **City:** Pacific Grove
- **Zip:** 93950
- **c. Address:** 945 Jewell Ave.
- **d. UTM:** Zone: 10; mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
- **e. Other Locational Data:** Elevation: A.P.N. 006-131-005-000

**P3a. Description:**
945 Jewell Ave is a single-story residence constructed in the Tudor Revival style. It features steeply pitched, cross-gabled roofs finished with eaves that project below the wall plate level. A prominent street-facing gable contains paired casement windows and false half-timbering in the gable end. The cross-gable on the front elevation has banked wood casement windows and an original entry door. Stucco finishes the exterior walls; irregular wood shakes finish the roof. A driveway leading to a detached garage runs along the east end of the property. See continuation sheet, page 3 for photographs (Figures 1 - 4).

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) HP2

**P4. Resources Present:**
- **Building** ☑
- **Structure** ☑
- **Object** ☑
- **Site** ☑
- **District** ☑
- **Element of District** ☑
- **Other (Isolates, etc.)**

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** North Elevation

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**
- **Historic** ☑
- **Prehistoric** ☐
- **Both** ☐
- **Circa 1928**

**P7. Owner and Address:**
Kevin Meldrum and Sue Ann Dahm
945 Jewell Ave.
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

**P8. Recorded by:**
Seth A. Bergstein, Principal
PAST Consultants, LLC
P.O. Box 721
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

**P9. Date Recorded:** 6/6/14

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)
Owner requested

**P11. Report Citation:** None

**Attachments:**
- **NONE**
- **Location Map**
- **Sketch Map**
- **Continuation Sheet**
- **Building, Structure, and Object Record**
- **Archaeological Record**
- **District Record**
- **Linear Feature Record**
- **Milling Station Record**
- **Rock Art Record**
- **Artifact Record**
- **Photograph Record**
- **Other (List):**

DPR 523A (1/95) *Required information*
**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD**

State of California — The Resources Agency

*Resource Name or #* (Assigned by recorder) 945 Jewell Ave.  
*NRHP Status Code* 5S1

**B1. Historic Name:** N/A  
**B2. Common Name:** None  
**B3. Original Use:** Residential  
**B4. Present Use:** Residential

**B5. Architectural Style:** Tudor Revival

**B6. Construction History:** (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
The house and garage have received only minor alterations since their circa-1928 construction date. An aluminum slider window replacement to the side (west) elevation was installed at an unknown date (Figure 3). The original garage door has been replaced (Figure 2).

**B7. Moved?** ☑No ☐Yes ☐Unknown  
**B8. Related Features:** N/A

**B9a. Architect:** Unknown  
**B9b. Builder:** Unknown

**B10. Significance:**  
**Theme:** Residential Architecture  
**Area:** Pacific Grove  
**Period of Significance:** Circa 1928 to 1964  
**Property Type:** Residence  
**Applicable Criteria:** (Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

See continuation sheets, pages 4-5.

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) HP2

**B12. References:**

- Historical Files, 945 Jewell Ave., Pacific Grove Heritage.  
- Building File, 945 Jewell Ave., City of Pacific Grove.  

**B13. Remarks:**
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PAST Consultants, LLC
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P3a. Description: Photographs

Figure 1. Front (north) elevation of house.
Figure 2. Front (north) elevation of garage with replaced door.

Figure 3. Rear (south) and side (west) elevations of house. Original casement window replaced with slider (arrow).
Figure 4. Rear (south) elevation of garage.
A building permit for the house’s construction was issued to Ethel P. Young in 1926. Documentation from the Heritage Society of Pacific Grove indicates the year built as 1928. Based on this information, a circa-1928 construction date is chosen for the house and garage. City directories (Polk’s Salinas, Monterey, Pacific Grove and Carmel 1930 – 1965) do not list Ethel P. Young as occupying the house. The first residents listed in the house and continuing until 1965 are John Jay and Lona Harris, Jr. John J. Harris, Jr. worked at the First National Bank of Monterey and eventually became the Bank’s Vice President. His wife, Lona Harris worked as a clerk for Pease Prescription Pharmacy in Monterey. John J. Harris, Jr. (1899-1963) died in 1963, but his wife remained at the house.

945 Jewell Ave. is not historically significant under National (NR) or State (CR) Register criteria. It is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (NR-A; CR-1); John J. and Lona Harris are not significant or important in our past (NR-B; CR-2). While the house is an excellent example of a nearly intact Tudor Revival-style dwelling, it does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction (NR-C; CR-3) at a National or State level. However, the property is eligible for inclusion on the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Resource Inventory.

The eligibility criteria for local listing in the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) are described in the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code §23.76.025) as follows:

a. Whether the structure has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city of Pacific Grove, the state of California, or the United States;
b. Whether it is the site of a significant historic event;
c. Whether it is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove;
d. Whether it is a particularly good example of a period or style;
e. Whether it is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pacific Grove possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;
f. Whether it is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city of Pacific Grove;
g. Whether it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation;
h. Whether it has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or of the city of Pacific Grove;
i. Whether it retains the integrity of the original design;
j. Whether it contributes to the architectural aesthetics and continuity of the street; and
k. Whether it is located within a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic properties which visually contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically.

945 Jewell Ave. satisfies items a, d, i and j of the City’s HRI. As an example of the Tudor Revival style, the house has significant character, interest and value as part of the development of Pacific Grove (a); is a particularly good example of the Tudor Revival style (d); retains the integrity of the original design (i); and contributes to the architectural aesthetics and continuity of the street (j). According to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement the house is a representative property type illustrating the theme, “City of Homes (1927 – 1945).” The house has sufficient historic integrity to communicate its Tudor Revival style. According to the City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, the character-defining features of the Tudor Revival style are:

- Rectangular massing with asymmetrical facades.
- Steeply-pitched gable roofs, usually in combination of side and front-facing gables.
- Shallow eaves or eaveless.
- Stucco cladding, smooth or textured.
- Arched entries, sometimes set within gabled porch elements.
- Rusticated masonry accents around doors and windows.
- Vertical attic vents in the gable end, sometimes with arched tops.
- Exterior chimney, sometimes with decorative brickwork.
945 Jewell Ave. maintains these character-defining features because little alterations have occurred. An original casement window was removed on the side (west) elevation; and the garage door has been replaced. Aside from these changes, the house and garage are essentially intact.

The following evaluates the minimum eligibility requirements, according to the *City of Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement*:

**Minimum Eligibility Requirements:**
- Clear example of residential architecture from this period. Yes
- Retains original form and roofline. Yes
- Retains the original pattern of window and doors. Yes
- Retains original cladding (or the original cladding has been repaired/replaced in kind such that it substantially duplicates the original pattern). Yes
- Retains most of its original ornamentation, if applicable. Yes

945 Jewell Ave. retains sufficient historic integrity as described below:

- **Setting:** The house remains in its original neighborhood setting of single-family homes and has integrity of setting.
- **Location:** The house remains in its original location and has integrity of location.
- **Design:** The house retains integrity of design because it is nearly intact, with few alterations.
- **Workmanship:** Replacement of one set of paired casement windows and the garage door are minimal. The house maintains integrity of workmanship.
- **Materials:** The house maintains its half-timbering, roof massing and cladding materials. Although removal of original casement windows on the west elevation has occurred, the house retains sufficient integrity of materials.
- **Feeling:** The house retains enough character-defining features to retain integrity of feeling.
- **Association:** The house retains enough character-defining features for it to be a representative property type under the City of Houses theme as described in the Context Statement.

In conclusion, 945 Jewell Ave. does not qualify as an individual historic resource under National or State register criteria. However, the house does satisfy four aspects of the City of Pacific Grove’s HRI and maintains sufficient historic integrity to qualify the property as a local resource.
RATTO RESIDENCE
945 JEWELL AVENUE
PACIFIC GROVE, CA 93950
A.P.N. = 006-131-005

FINISH MATERIALS

(N) STUCCO SIDING (SMOOTH FINISH)
(E) STUCCO SIDING (TEXTURED FINISH)
COLOR: WHITE (MATCH EXISTING)

50 YR. COMPOSITION ROOFING
COLOR: EARTH-TONE (MATCH EXIST.)
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COLOR: EARTH-TONE & GRAYS

EXTERIOR LIGHT FIXTURE
COLOR: OIL RUB BRONZE FINISH
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WATTAGE: (1) 150 WATT A21 MED. BASE BULB
WARM AMBIENT DOWN LIGHT

MILGARD: WINDOWS & PATIO DOORS
MATERIAL: CLAD EXTER. / WOOD INTER.
COLOR: DARK BRONZE
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945 Jewell Avenue
Pacific Grove, California 93950
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PROJECT ADDRESS
945 Jewell Avenue
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950

PLOT NUMBER
PACIFIC GROVE 1007

SITE AREA
11,756 SF.

CONSTRUCTION TYPE
V-3

OCCUPANCY TYPE
R-3

EXISTING SEWER SYSTEM
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1. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPS): At this time, if possible, avoid land-disturbing activities during the wet weather season: October 1 through April 15. Otherwise, earth-moving materials, native rolls (small bags), mulch, shredded, plastic cover shall be kept inside for pre-run installation.

2. EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL: As applicable, slope and soil stabilization measures shall be used to prevent runoff erosion and sedimentation from construction activities. All temporary erosion control shall be installed on-site. All off-site materials shall be contained, and all off-site storage areas shall be utilized to prevent erosion and sedimentation.

3. EXISTING URBAN VEGETATION: Protect existing urban vegetation. Avoid removal of existing trees. Some trees are to be retained in place. Additional trees may be required.

4. SOIL MOVEMENT: Soil movement shall be limited to the extent necessary to complete construction activities. All soil movement shall be confined to designated areas.

5. STOPLINE MANAGEMENT: T. All stop lines shall be maintained and protected. During, and after rains, stop lines shall be maintained. Stop line protection shall be evident along site perimeter to prevent movement of sediment and debris.

6. WASTE MANAGEMENT: All construction waste shall be contained and disposed of properly. No material shall be washed into the street.

7. VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT: Responsible parties must ensure all vehicles and equipment are maintained in good working order. All vehicles and equipment shall be covered to prevent rain water from entering into the vehicle.

8. DRAINAGE PROTECTION & PERIMETER CONTROLS: Drainage systems that receive storm water must be covered. All drainage system inlets shall be protected. Erosion control and siltation control shall be applied in a manner not to impede traffic or safety. Properly installed stop lines, erosion control, and equivalent linear control shall be evident along site perimeter to prevent movement of sediment and debris off-site. All drainage construction controls shall be evident along site perimeter to prevent movement of sediment and debris off-site. All drainage controls shall be maintained.

9. SWEEPING: All impervious surfaces (driveways, streets) shall be physically swept of debris daily or as required. Debris shall be contained in appropriate bags or bins. Debris shall be contained in appropriate bags or bins.

10. STEEL TREATED: All steel, rebar, and other metal products shall be coated with a rust inhibiting primer before use. All metal products shall be welded and fastened with appropriate fasteners.

11. PERMIT CONTROL: All permits required for construction shall be obtained prior to the site permit. All permits shall be maintained prior to the site permit. All permits shall be maintained prior to the site permit.
THE USE OF THESE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS IS RESTRICTED TO THE ORIGINAL SITE FOR WHICH THEY WERE PREPARED AND PUBLICATION THEREOF IS EXPRESSLY LIMITED TO SUCH USE. REUSE, REPRODUCTION OR PUBLICATION BY ANY METHOD IN WHOLE OR IN PART IS PROHIBITED. TITLE TO THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS REMAINS WITH THE ARCHITECT OR DESIGNER AND VISUAL CONTRACT WITH THEM CONSTITUTES PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF ACCEPTANCE OF THESE RESTRICTIONS.

STOCKPILE MANAGMENT DETAIL

NOTES:

1. ALL ROLLER PALLETS SHALL BEEventHandler AND COVERED WHEN NOT IN USE.
2. STOCKPILE AREA TO BE COVERED AND Secured DURING STORAGE PERIOD.
3. FIBER ROLLS TO BE AVAILABLE AT SITE.
4. PLACEMENT DETAILS TO BE CONFORMED TO CITY ORDINANCE.
5. ALL ROLLER PALLETS SHALL BE COVERED AND Secured DURING STORAGE PERIOD.

CONCRETE WASTE MANAGEMENT DETAIL

STORAGE AND DISPOSAL PROCEDURES

1. TEMPORARY SANITARY FACILITIES SHOULD BE LOCATED AWAY FROM UNDERGROUND FACILITIES, WATER SUPPLY, AND FROM TRAFFIC FLOW. IF SEWAGE CONDITIONS ALLOW, PLACED IN A PROTECTED AREA OFF-HIGHWAY CONDITIONS AND TRAFFIC AREAS.
2. WHEN SUBJECT TO HIGHER HAZARDS OR RISK OF HIGH HAZARDS, TEMPORARY SANITARY FACILITIES SHOULD BE SECURED TO PREVENT DISRUPTIONS.
3. TEMPORARY SANITARY FACILITIES MUST BE CAPPED WITH SECONDARY CONTAINMENT TO MINIMIZE THE RISK OF POLLUTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT.
4. ARRANGED FOR REGULAR WASTE COLLECTION DO NOT ALLOW SANITARY FACILITY TO BECOME HABITABLE.

EROSION CONTROL - FIBER ROLL DETAIL

SANITARY WASTE DETAIL
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New Addition & Remodel
Plan

Ratto Residence

845 Jewell Avenue
P.O. Box 131
Pacific Grove, California
A.P.N.: 006-131-005

LEGEND:
EXISTING WALLS TO REMAIN
EXISTING WALLS TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING FLOOR PLAN
DEMOLITION FLOOR PLAN

Existing & Demolition Floor Plan

1/4" = 1'-0"
Room Finish Material Notes:

1. All walls and ceilings of all existing rooms and the new addition shall be finished with materials that comply with the specifications of the existing building.

2. All wood framing to remain in place unless otherwise noted.

3. NEW ADDITION AND REMODEL:

   - The existing walls and ceilings may be painted or papered to match the finish of the new addition.
   - The new addition may be constructed with a variety of materials, including drywall, plaster, or other finishes as specified in the plans.

4. EXISTING WINDOWS:

   - All existing windows shall be retained unless otherwise noted.
   - New windows may be installed to match the existing style and size.

5. EXISTING OPENINGS:

   - All existing openings, including doors and windows, shall be retained unless otherwise noted.
   - New openings may be created to match the existing style and size.

Green Building Requirements:

1. All new construction shall comply with the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code (CGBT). This code includes requirements for energy efficiency, water conservation, and the use of sustainable materials.

2. Plumbing fixtures and fittings shall comply with the WaterSense program, which promotes the use of water-efficient fixtures.

3. Electrical systems shall comply with the National Electrical Code (NEC), which includes requirements for energy efficiency and the use of energy-efficient lighting.

4. The use of sustainable building materials, such as recycled content materials, shall be encouraged.

5. The building shall be designed to minimize the use of non-renewable resources.

6. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

7. The building shall be designed to minimize the use of non-renewable resources, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

8. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

9. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

10. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

11. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

12. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

13. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

14. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

15. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

16. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

17. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

18. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

19. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

20. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

21. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

22. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

23. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

24. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.

25. The building shall be designed to minimize the impact on the environment, including the use of materials that are harmful to the environment.
The use of these plans and specifications is restricted to the original site for which they were prepared and publication thereof is expressly limited to such use. Reproduction or publication by any method in whole or in part is prohibited. Title to the plans and specifications remains with the architect or designer and visual contract with them constitutes prima facie evidence of acceptance of these restrictions.

Aaron S. Tollefson, Designer
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For:

945 Jewell Avenue
Pacific Grove, California
A.P.N.: 006-131-005

Ratto Residence

West Exterior Elevation

Window Flashing Installation Details

1.
ELECTRICAL NOTES:
1. All work is to be installed in accordance with the local codes and regulations.
2. All wiring and insulation shall be of suitable material and quality as specified in the drawings.
3. All electrical work shall be performed by a licensed electrician.
4. All switches and outlets shall be installed in accordance with the local codes and regulations.
5. All electrical boxes shall be of suitable material and quality as specified in the drawings.

CARBON MONOXIDE NOTES:
1. Carbon monoxide alarms shall be installed in all sleeping areas and bathrooms.
2. All electrical outlets and switches shall be installed in accordance with the local codes and regulations.
3. All electrical circuits shall be installed in accordance with the local codes and regulations.
4. All electrical panels and meters shall be installed in accordance with the local codes and regulations.

TITLE 24 LIGHTING MEASURES:
1. All lighting shall be of high efficacy.
2. Permanent permanent (plenum)-located other than interior, residential, garage, or exterior fixtures shall be of high efficiency, LED lamps.

Residence Plan
Dwell, Del Rey Oaks, CA 93940
Phone: (831) 578-3450

New Electrical & Mechanical Plan
New Addition & Remodel
A1.9
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TO: Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board

FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner

MEETING DATE: February 12, 2019

PERMIT APPLICATION NO.: Architectural Permit (AP) / Tree Removal Permit (TP-D) Application No. 18-0896

LOCATION: 909 Egan Ave. Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-092-009)

SUBJECT: The demolition and remodel of a portion of an existing two-story residence to allow a 176 sq. ft. first-floor rear addition, the addition of a second-story deck at the front of the house and the removal of one (1) 19” diameter non-native holly tree. The project is in compliance with the development standards of the R-1 zoning district.

APPLICANT: Fletcher+Hardoin Architects on behalf of Paul and Debbie Baker, owners

ZONING/LAND USE: R-1 (4,000 sf min. lot size) / Residential Medium Density (up to 17.4 dwelling units/acre)

CEQA: Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(e), Minor Additions to Existing Residences

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the project subject to the recommended findings, conditions and a Class 1, Section 15301(e) CEQA exemption for Minor Additions to Existing Residences.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposed project is for the remodel of an existing 3,443 sq. ft., two-story residence to allow the demolition and reconstruction of a 176 sq. ft. first-floor rear addition, the addition of a second-story deck at the front (northwest corner) of the house that will mirror the existing balcony on the northeast corner, and the removal of one (1) 19” diameter non-native holly tree. Five (5) other trees (2 eucalyptus, 2 fruit, and 1 holly tree, all under 12” diameter) will be removed but, given their size and species, are not regulated under Title 12 of the PGMC. The 10,616 sq. ft. lot is flat and developed with a detached two-car garage in addition to the residence. The project is in compliance with the development standard of the R-1 zoning district.
BACKGROUND
Site Description
The approximately 10,616 sq. ft. lot is generally flat. The property has double-frontage on Egan and Jewell Avenues; the driveway and garage access from Jewell Avenue while the residence is oriented to the north or Egan Avenue. In addition to the non-native trees slated for removal, a 12” oak on the east side of the property will be retained and a large cluster of oaks ranging in size from 18”-28” diameter near the Jewell Avenue right-of-way will be pruned and limbed for maintenance purposes.

Surrounding Land Uses
The parcel’s immediate vicinity is developed primarily with one- and two-story residential residences on similarly-sized lots. Neither Egan nor Jewell Avenues have sidewalks currently and none are required as a result of this project. The City’s Municipal Golf Course is located just east of the project.

DISCUSSION
Applicable General Plan Policies
The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and policies that call for the orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. This residential project helps the City achieve several of its housing goals as stated in the General Plan and is compatible with the Residential Medium-Density land use designation.

The policies of the General Plan are implemented through the R-1 zoning district which allows low- and medium-density single-family development in the Fairway Tract neighborhood. Although the project does not result in a net increase in housing units, additions to and remodels of existing single-family residences are allowed within the general plan designation of Residential Medium-Density.

Applicable Zoning Code Regulations
The City of Pacific Grove’s General Plan Land Use Map designates the subject parcel as Residential Medium-Density. This designation provides for residential development up to 17.4 dwelling units per acre.

The proposed project is in full compliance with the zoning regulations set forth in PGMC 23.16 (R-1). This includes and is not limited to the height limit, setback requirements, floor area and allowable site coverage. The project is also in compliance with the parking standards for single-family residential development which requires two covered parking spaces. This project provides a two-car garage and room for additional vehicles in the driveway which is accessed from Jewell Avenue.

The protection of the City’s trees is implemented through Title 12 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code (PGMC). The subject property is not located near or within the Monarch butterfly habitat buffer area nor does it appear that the removal of six (6) non-native trees will result in a significant negative impact on biological resources in the area. According to the applicant’s Arborist’s assessment (Ono, Nov. 2018), half of the trees proposed to be removed are in poor condition or dead, and the other three are in fair condition. The permit includes a
condition requiring the protection of the oaks to be retained from any construction impacts that might occur.

**Tree Removal**
The proposal includes the removal of one (1) 19” diameter non-native holly tree which is regulated as a protected tree per PGMC § 12.20.020. Five (5) other non-regulated trees will be removed that were identified by licensed arborist, Frank Ono, (Ono, November 2018) to be in fair to dead condition. The non-regulated trees to be removed are 1 holly tree, two fruit, and 2 eucalyptus; all but one are less than 12” diameter. The 12” fruit tree is dead. Because the 19” holly, although in poor condition, is greater than 12” diameter, the City’s replanting requirements are triggered. The conditions of approval include the replanting of one tree, to be approved by the City arborist. If there is room on the property, one of the following native species is preferred: Gowen cypress, Coast live oak, Monterey cypress, Shore pine, Torrey pine, or Monterey pine.

**Architecture and Design Considerations**
The proposed rear remodel and small addition will match the existing exterior materials on the remainder of the house (see attached photos) including horizontal wood siding, aluminum clad double-paned windows and doors in forest green, asphalt shingles and exterior light fixtures. The proposed remodel and small addition between the rear of the house and the existing detached garage will be nominally visible from either street frontage. The remodel also includes replacing the front door with a new door and new sidelights on either side, new French doors onto the existing front deck, new French doors onto the new second-story deck on the northwest corner of the house, the removal of the existing chimney, a small bump-out on the east elevation to accommodate new gas fireplace, and the relocation of existing and addition of new windows on the east, west and south elevations as depicted on the elevation sheets (attached).

The project complies with a variety of the recommendations in the Design Guidelines, including the following:

**No. 7 – Second floor balconies and decks should be designed and located to minimize the loss of privacy for neighboring properties.**

The proposed second-floor balcony of approximately 77 sq. ft. to be developed in the northwest corner will mirror the existing balcony on the northeast corner. It will have a solid wood half-wall railing with a wood rail at the top. Although this location is closer to the neighbor to the west than the existing balcony, the neighbor currently has tall shrubbery that partially blocks views from the windows and potentially from the proposed balcony into their yard. And the solid half-wall will help preserve the privacy of both the neighbor to the west as well as individuals enjoying the balcony.

**No. 9 – Attempt to preserve some portion of neighbors’ views by carefully positioning or limiting the width, depth, or height of the proposed building elements.**

The demolition of the existing rear portion of the home to be reconstructed with a 176 sq. ft. increase in size will substantially preserve the neighbors’ views as they are. The existing building has an average height of approximately 12’ and includes a 15’ tall chimney. The new residential development will have an average height of 14’ with no chimney.

**No. 23 – Consult the City Forester regarding tree protection measures during construction.**
The permit includes a condition of approval requiring that standard tree protection measures are in place to protect the trees to remain, specifically the oak on the east side which is closest to where potentially damaging construction activities may occur. The City’s Arborist reviewed the tree assessment (Ono, Nov. 2018) and concurs with the findings and recommendations therein.

**No. 27 – A building should be in scale with its site.**

The proposed remodel and addition push the envelope in terms of allowed gross floor area, but the project meets the standards and is not out of place given the size of the lot and the surrounding residential developments.

**No. 28 – An addition should complement and balance the overall form, mass, and composition of the existing building.**

The proposed addition, second-story balcony and window installation/relocation will be complimentary to the existing form, mass and composition of the residence.

**Landscape & Lighting**

The property is fully landscaped and no changes to the existing landscaping, other than the removal of one regulated tree and five other non-regulated trees, is proposed. In compliance with Design Guidelines No. 10 and No. 12, exterior lighting will be positioned so that no direct light extends onto neighboring properties and the light fixtures will be compatible with the architectural style of the project.

**Archaeology**

The property is located in an area of known archaeological sensitivity. In preparation for the garage that was built in 2000, the previous owners had both a Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance (Archaeological Consulting, January 1999) completed and a follow-up Archaeological Hand Excavation Report (Archaeological Resource Management, April 1999) completed to address the potential for the discovery of historic and/or cultural artifacts and the appropriate treatment thereof. The conditions of approval for this permit include the requirement of an Archaeological Monitor and a standard inadvertent discovery protocol. Due to the sensitive nature of these archaeological reports, they are confidential and not provided for public review.

**Stormwater Treatment Measure**

The small scale of this project does not trigger stormwater requirements.

**Water**

Water availability must be established prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the proposed residence. If water is not available, the property will be added to the City’s water wait list.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**

In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(e), Class 1, Minor Additions to Existing Structures.

Section 15301(e), Class 1 consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical
equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination. The types of "existing facilities" itemized below are not intended to be all-inclusive of the types of projects which might fall within Class 1. The key consideration is whether the project involves negligible or no expansion of an existing use. Examples include but are not limited to:

(e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than:

1. 50% of the floor area of the structures before the addition, or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less.

The project is not subject to the exceptions to these exemptions per Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines relating to location, cumulative impacts, significant effects, scenic highways, hazardous waste sites, or historical resources.

FINDINGS
Staff recommends if AP/TP-D 18-0896 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended findings (see Attachment C, Draft Permit).

CONDITIONS
Staff recommends if AP/TP-D 18-0896 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended conditions (see Attachment C, Draft Permit).

ATTACHMENTS
A. Application
B. Tree Resources Assessment (Ono, November 2018)
C. Draft Permit
D. Site Plan, Elevations, Project Data Sheet
E. Existing and Proposed Exterior Materials Sheet
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SUMMARY

Development is proposed for this site known requiring excavation near trees on site. The project proposes approximately 151 square foot of remodel and addition to a single-family dwelling. There are a number of planted trees on the property as well as existing native trees; the trees are considered to range from poor or better condition both structurally and in health. Excavation and hardscape removal will be performed near a number of trees in particular several ornamental trees will need to be removed. At this time, it appears the property owner is requesting removal of five (5) ornamental trees to be removed during the project and the pruning of a large mature oak that is outside the project area. A tree assessment/arborist report has been prepared that identifies and addresses the affects that the project will have to the existing tree resources on site as well as a list of recommendations regarding trees on the project.

INTRODUCTION

This tree assessment/arborist report is prepared for Mr. and Mrs. Paul and Debbie Baker, the owners of the property located at 909 Egan Ave, by Frank Ono, Urban Forester and Certified Arborist (member Society of American Foresters Member #48004 and International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist #536) due to the proposed construction. The City of Pacific Grove Land Use Plan and City Zoning Ordinances identify native trees six inches in diameter along with other tree species 12” or greater in diameter as the tree species requiring protection and special consideration for management.
ASSIGNMENT/SCOPE OF PROJECT

To ensure protection of the tree resources on site, the property owners, Mr. and Mrs. Paul and Debbie Baker, have requested an assessment of the trees in proximity to proposed development areas. The findings of the report are to be documented in an arborist report to work in conjunction with other conditions for approval of the building permit application. To accomplish this assignment, the following tasks have been completed:

- Evaluate health, structure and preservation suitability for each tree within or adjacent (15 feet or less) to proposed development of trees greater than or equal to six diameter inches at 54 inches above grade.
- Review proposed building site plans as provided by Fletcher + Hardoin Architects.
- Make recommendations for alternative methods and preconstruction treatments to facilitate tree retention.
- Create preservation specifications, as it relates to a Tree Location/Preservation Map.
- Determine the quantity of protected trees affected by construction as defined by the City of Pacific Grove Zoning Ordinance 12.20.020; as well as mitigation requirements for those to be affected.
- Document findings in the form of a report as required by the City of Pacific Grove Planning Department.

LIMITATIONS

This assignment is limited to the review of plans submitted to me dated October 23, 2018 by Fletcher + Hardoin Architects to assess affects from potential construction to trees within or adjacent to construction activities. The assessment has been made of these plans specifically and no other plans were reviewed. Only minor grading and erosion details are discussed in this report as it relates to tree health. It is not the intent of this report to be a monetary valuation of the trees or provide risk assessment for any tree on this parcel, as any tree can fail at any time. No clinical diagnosis was performed on any pest or pathogen that may or may not be present. In addition to an inspection of the property, F.O. Consulting relied on information provided in the preparation of this report (such as, surveys, property boundaries, and property ownership) and must reasonably rely on the accuracy of the information provided. F.O. Consulting shall not be responsible for another's means, methods, techniques, schedules, sequence or procedures, or for contractor safety or any other related programs; or for another's failure to complete the work in accordance with the plans and specifications.
PURPOSE AND GOAL

This Tree Assessment/Arborist report is prepared for this parcel due to proposed construction activities located at 909 Egan Ave, in Pacific Grove, CA. The purpose of the assessment is to determine what, if any, of the trees will be affected by the proposed project. Oak trees are considered protected trees as defined by the City of Pacific Grove Zoning Ordinances.

The goal of this report is to protect and maintain the Pacific Grove Urban forested resources through the adherence of development standards, which allow the protection, and maintenance of its forest resources. Furthermore it is the intended goal of this report to aid in planning to offset any potential effects of proposed development on the property while encouraging forest stability and sustainability, perpetuating the forested character of the property and the immediate vicinity.

SITE DESCRIPTION

1) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 006-092-009-000.

2) Location: 909 Egan Ave, in Pacific Grove, CA 93950.

3) Parcel size: 0.24 Acres.

4) Existing Land Use: The parcel is zoned for residential use.

5) Slope: The parcel ranges from mild to steep sloped. Slopes range from 2% to over 5%.

6) Soils: The parcel is located on soils classified by the Monterey County Soils report as Baywood Sand soils. This is a moderately excessively drained soil on historic sand dunes. Slopes are mostly about 2 to15 percent. Runoff is very low, and the erosion hazard is very low. Roots can penetrate to a depth of over 60 inches.

7) Vegetation: The site is developed and has ornamental planting. The vegetation on site is composed primarily of several oaks with scattered holly, fruit, and eucalyptus trees.

8) Forest Condition and Health: The stand of trees and health are evaluated with the use of the residual trees combined with surrounding adjacent trees as a complete stand. The site is developed and surrounding forest canopy is fragmented. It is a developed stabilized sand dune with most surrounding parcels containing non-native ornamental plantings as well. Most the ornamental trees on site are declining or dead due to salt wind coming off from the ocean.
BACKGROUND

Assessment focuses on incorporation of the preliminary location of site improvements coupled with consideration for the general goals of site improvement desired of the landowner. The property owner indicated they wish to remove sever non-native trees during the project implementation to accommodate future landscaping. Proposed improvements assessed included preserving native trees to the greatest extent feasible, maintaining the view shed and general aesthetic quality of the area while complying with City of Pacific Grove Municipal Codes. The study of individual trees determined treatments necessary to complete the project and meet the goals of the landowner. Trees within and immediately adjacent proposed development area were located, measured, inspected, flagged and recorded. The assessment of each tree concluded with an opinion of whether the tree should be removed, or preserved, based on the extent and effect of construction activity to the short and long-term health of the tree. All meetings and field review were focused on the area immediately surrounding the proposed development.

OBSERVATIONS/DISCUSSION

The following list includes observations made while on site, and summarizes details discussed during this stage of the planning process.

- The site is developed with an existing structure and hardscaped parking area.
- Six (6) trees are proposed for removal with the project.
  - Two (2) Eucalyptus trees in fair condition (#261 and #262) and are located within the proposed building envelope.
  - Two (2) fruit trees in poor condition (#264 and #265).
  - Two (2) holly trees ranging from poor to fair condition (#260 and #263).
- Two (2) oaks are located scattered on the property which are to be retained.
  - #259 is a mature oak located in the front yard in fair condition.
  - #266 is a large mature multi stemmed oak located outside the rear fence along Jewell Ave in fair or better condition. The tree is proposed for trimming and thinning for tree health and structure.
- One (1) holly tree (No Tag) is located near the utility pole on Egan Ave and is to be retained.

TREE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Remove</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Tag</td>
<td>holly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>oak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>holly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Fungus - bleeding at base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>holly</td>
<td>5,5,6</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>7,5,6</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Fungus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>dead</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>27,28,20,18</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>prune, thin, deadwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Subject to Tree Permit requirements ≤"2" dia.

909 Egan Ave – Tree Assessment
November 26, 2018
Not an Official City Document
CONCLUSION/PROJECT ASSESSMENT

This proposal to remodel and build an addition to a single-family residence is planned to maintain the existing urban forested environment, allowing the urban forest canopy to continue to exist and regenerate over time. Six (6) trees are proposed or expected for removal prior to construction. Two Eucalyptus are within the building envelope. Other trees for removal are non-native ornamental that are dead or range from poor to fair condition as mentioned in the tree chart. All other remaining trees are expected to survive when properly protected and monitored.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Tree Pruning

It is to be understood that the pruning of retained trees is expected for this site, especially the oak near the building construction area and the oak outside the fence. Pruning will include deadwood removal, and address minor structural defects or disease, and possibly vehicle or pedestrian clearance. Trees should be monitored on occasion for health and vigor after pruning. Should the health and vigor of any tree decline it will be treated as appropriately recommended by a certified arborist or qualified forester. Remedial pruning should occur prior to construction. Following construction, any above ground tree pruning/trimming should be delayed until one year after completion of construction. Following construction, a qualified arborist should monitor trees adjacent to the improvements area and if any decline in health that is attributable to the construction is noted, additional trees should be planted on the site.

Tree Protection

Best management practices include protection of trees during construction, therefore, prior to the commencement of construction activities:

- Trees located adjacent to construction areas shall be protected from damage by construction equipment by the use of temporary fencing and through wrapping of trunks with protective materials.
- Fencing shall consist of chain link, snowdrift, plastic mesh, hay bales, or field fence. Existing fencing may also be used.
- Fencing must not be to be attached to the tree. It shall be free standing or self-supporting so as not to damage trees. Fencing shall be rigidly supported and shall stand a minimum of height of four feet above grade.
- Soil compaction, parking of vehicles or heavy equipment, stockpiling of construction materials, and/or dumping of materials should not be allowed adjacent to trees on the property especially within fenced areas.
- Fenced areas and the trunk protection materials must remain in place during the entire construction period.
During grading and excavation activities:

- All trenching, grading or any other digging or soil removal that is expected to encounter tree roots will be monitored by a qualified arborist or forester to ensure against drilling or cutting into or through major roots.
- The project arborist should be on site during excavation activities to direct any minor field adjustments that may be needed.
- Trenching for the retaining wall and driveway located adjacent to any tree should be done by hand where practical and any roots greater than 3-inches diameter should be bridged or pruned appropriately.
- Any roots that must be cut should be cut by manually digging a trench and cutting exposed roots with a saw, vibrating knife, rock saw, narrow trencher with sharp blades, or other approved root pruning equipment.
- Any roots damaged during grading or excavation should be exposed to sound tissue and cut cleanly with a saw.

If at any time potentially significant roots are discovered:

- The arborist/forester will be authorized to halt excavation until appropriate mitigation measures are formulated and implemented.
- If significant roots are identified that must be removed that will destabilize or negatively affects the target trees negatively, the property owner will be notified immediately and a determination for removal will be assessed and made as required by law for treatment of the area that will not risk death decline or instability of the tree consistent with the implementation of appropriate construction design approaches to minimize affects, such as hand digging, bridging or tunneling under roots, etc..

Best Management Practices to Observe (BMP)

The following best management practices must be adhered to:

A) Tree service contractors will verify animal or bird nesting prior to tree work. If nesting activity of migratory birds are found, work must stop and a wildlife biologist consulted before commencing work (the typical bird nesting season ranges from February 22 to August 1).

B) Do not deposit any fill around trees, which may compact soils and alter water and air relationships. Avoid depositing fill, parking equipment, or staging construction materials near existing trees. Covering and compacting soil around trees can alter water and air relationships with the roots. Fill placed within the drip line may encourage the development of oak rot fungus (Armillaria mellea). As necessary, trees may be protected by boards, fencing or other materials to delineate protection zones.

C) Pruning shall be conducted so as not to unnecessarily injure the tree. General- Principals of pruning include placing cuts immediately beyond the branch collar, making clean cuts by scoring the underside of the branch first, and for live oak, avoiding the period from February through May.

D) Native live trees are not adapted to summer watering and may develop crown or root rot as a result. Do not regularly irrigate within the drip line of oaks. Native, locally adapted, drought resistant species are the most compatible with this goal.
E) Root cutting should occur outside of the springtime. Late June and July would likely be the best. Pruning of the live crown should not occur February through May.

F) Tree material greater than 3 inches in diameter remaining on site more than one month that is not cut and split into firewood must be covered with thick clear plastic that is dug in securely around the pile to discourage infestation and dispersion of bark beetles.

G) A mulch layer up to approximately 4 inches deep should be applied to the ground under selected trees following construction. Only 1 to 2 inches of mulch should be applied within 1 to 2 feet of the trunk, and under no circumstances should any soil or mulch be placed against the root crown (base) of trees. The best source of mulch would be from chipped material generated on site.

H) If trees along near the development are visibly declining in vigor, a Professional Forester or Certified Arborist should be contacted to inspect the site to recommend a course of action.

Report Prepared By: 

[Signature] 

November 26, 2018

Frank Ono, SAF Forester #48004 and ISA Certified Arborist #536 Date
PHOTOGRAPHS

Trees #259 (Oak) and #260 (Holly) to be removed due to its poor condition.
Tree #259 growing through fence, vines will be removed for tree's health.
Trees #262 in foreground is within building footprint.
Tree #261 in background is within the building foot print.
Tree #263 Holly is less than 12" in diameter and is proposed for removal.
Tree #264 is a fruit tree to be removed. Tree #266 is the oak in background to be crown cleaned.
Tree #265 is dead and to be removed
ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AP) AND TREE REMOVAL PERMIT (TP-D) 18-0896
FOR A RESIDENTIAL REMODEL INCLUDING A 176 SQ. FT. SINGLE-STORY ADDITION IN THE
REAR OF THE EXISTING TWO-STORY RESIDENCE AND A NEW SECOND-STORY DECK OF 77
SQ. FT. TO MATCH EXISTING. THE PROJECT INCLUDES REMOVAL OF SIX (6) NON-NATIVE
TREES

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 909 Egan Avenue, Pacific Grove, 93950 (APN 006-092-009)
2. The subject site has a designation of Residential Medium Density on the adopted City of Pacific Grove
   General Plan Land Use Map.
3. The project site is located in the Fairway Tract neighborhood and in the Residential Single-Family zoning
district and has a 4,000 sq. ft. minimum parcel size (R-1).
4. The subject site is approximately 10,616 sq. ft. in size.
5. The subject site is currently developed with an approximately 3,443 sq. ft. two-story residence and a
detached garage 2-car garage.
6. The subject site is located in the Area of Special Biological Significance and the Archaeological sensitivity
zone, but is not in the Coastal zone nor is the 35 year old residence included on the City’s Historic
Resources Inventory.
7. Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance and follow-up Hand Excavation Reports were completed in
1999 in preparation for the construction of the detached garage in 2000. This permit is conditioned to
require onsite monitoring during new ground disturbing activities and to ensure that any cultural resource
discovery during excavation for the addition is adequately addressed.
8. A certified arborist prepared a Tree Resource Assessment and Management Plan (Ono, Nov. 2018) which
was reviewed by the City’s arborist. The recommendations of the Management Plan have been incorporated
herein as conditions of approval.
9. This project has been determined to be CEQA Exempt under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301(e), Minor
Additions to Existing Structures.

FINDINGS
Architectural Permits are subject to the following findings per PGMC Section 23.70.060(f):
1. The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood;
2. The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor
impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
3. The board has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review
guidelines in making its determinations on the structure.

The architectural style and materials, and site design are in substantial conformance to the City’s Residential
Design Guidelines, specifically Nos. 7, 9, 23, 27 and 28 relating to second floor balconies, height of the
addition, tree maintenance and preservation, and neighborhood compatibility, and Nos. 10-12 relating to
exterior lighting.

In order to issue a Tree Permit, the following findings of PGMC Section 12.20.040 must be made:
1. The Tree is causing or is projected to cause significant damage to hardscape (house foundations, driveways,
retaining walls, patios, etc.), utility service lines, or infrastructure (sidewalk, curb, storm drain, Street, etc.)
and there are not more cost-effective remedial solutions.
2. Such other conditions as agreed to by the city arborist and the property owner.
The proposed remodel, addition, and tree removal are in compliance with the zoning code and general plan. The tree removal is subject to the recommendations of the applicant’s licensed arborist and conditions imposed by the City’s arborist in compliance with PGMC Title 12.

PERMIT
Architectural Permit (AP)/Tree Permit-Development (TPD) 18-0896: The proposed project is for the remodel of an existing 3,443 sq. ft., two-story residence to allow a 176 sq. ft. first-floor rear addition, the addition of a second-story deck at the front (northwest corner) of the house that will mirror the existing balcony on the northeast corner and the removal of six (6) non-native trees (2 eucalyptus, 2 fruit, and 2 holly trees, all under 12” diameter except 1 holly). The 10,616 sq. ft. lot is flat and developed with a detached two-car garage in addition to the residence. The project is in compliance with the development standard of the R-1 zoning district.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. Permit Expiration. This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.

2. Construction Compliance. All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require Architectural Review Board approval.

3. Terms and Conditions. These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community and Economic Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

4. Archaeological Monitor. In compliance with the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist who conducted site testing in 1999 (Archaeological Hand Excavation Report (Archaeological Resource Management, April 1999), the owner shall employ a qualified archaeologist or contract with the Ohlone-Costanoan Esselen Tribe for a Tribal monitor to be onsite and observing the excavation of new perimeter foundations and footings to ensure that any discovered materials are appropriately handled. Prior to issuance of new construction building permit(s), the owner shall provide the Community Development Department with a copy of the contract and contact information for the monitor.

5. Archaeological Resources (General). If archaeological resources or human remains are unexpectedly discovered during construction, work shall be halted on the project parcel until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated, with the approval of the lead agency, and implemented.

6. Public Works, Fire and Building. Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit. Any work taking place in the public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit prior to issuance of the building permit.

7. Tree Removal and Pruning. As referenced on approved site plans prepared by Fletcher+Hardoin Architects dated December 20, 2018 (revised), the proposed tree removal and maintenance limbing shall be conducted in compliance with the recommendations of the Tree Resource Assessment prepared by Frank Ono dated November 2018 (Ono, Nov 2018). Per the City Arborist’s comments, the project does not require replanting.

8. Tree Replacement. Removal of any Protected Tree on a property that does not meet the canopy coverage goals, as defined in Municipal Code Section 12.20.080, shall require that one replacement tree be planted.
in its place. Replacement trees shall be of a suitable species and planted in a suitable location, as agreed to by the city arborist and the property owner. For upper canopy trees on lots with available landscape area in excess of 2,000 square feet, at least half of all replacement trees shall be native trees (Gowen cypress, Coast live oak, Monterey cypress, Shore pine, Torrey pine, or Monterey pine).

9. **Tree Protection Standards During Construction.** Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapters 12.20 and 12.30, and the *Urban Forestry Standards*, all trees that are otherwise protected and will be impacted as a result of Development, both proposed for pruning or removal and where the development will impact the critical root zone of the tree are protected. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the Project Arborist shall review grading, drainage, utility, building and landscape plans to determine impacts to individual Trees, to determine required minimum Tree protection standards during construction and submit a report to the City Arborist for review and approval.

10. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

11. **Exterior Lighting.** All exterior lighting fixtures shall conform to Architectural Review Guidelines #10-#12.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:

1. The Board determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Board authorizes Approval of Architectural Permit (AP) / Tree Removal Permit (TR-D) 18-0896 through the adoption of CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(e), Class 1, for Minor Additions to Existing Structures.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE 12th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

- AYES: 
- NOES: 
- ABSENT: 
- ABSTENTIONS: 
- APPROVED: 

Sarah Boyle, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

Paul and Debbie Baker, owner(s) Date
SECOND FLOOR EXISTING/DEMO PLAN

LEGEND

- Solid line: Wall
- Broken line: ceiling will be removed
- Dotted line: entrance will be removed and replaced with new one

DEMOULATION CALCULATIONS - SECOND FLOOR

- Bedroom 3
- Bedroom 4
- Bath 3
- Office
- Balcony
- Sitting Rm.

BAKER RESIDENCE
909 ESMAY AVE
PACIFIC DRIVE, CA 90234

PROJECT NO.:

ARCHITECT:
FLETCHER + HARDIN

CONTRACTOR:

BUILDING PERMIT:

DOCUMENT:

DRAWN BY:

ISSUED BY:

SCALE:

NOTE:
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TO: Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board

FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner

MEETING DATE: January 8, 2019

PERMIT APPLICATION NO.: Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Application No. 18-0957

LOCATION: 905 Lighthouse Ave. Pacific Grove, CA 93950 (APN 006-342-003)

SUBJECT: The proposed development includes the demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sf addition to the front elevation of the existing 1926 Craftsman style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sf ADU above. The project complies with the development standards of the R-4 zoning district.

APPLICANT: MBA Architects on behalf of Richard Gallagher, owner

ZONING/LAND USE: R-4 / Residential High Density (up to 29 dwelling units/acre)

CEQA: Categorical Exemptions, Sections 15301(l) and 15303(a), Residential Demolition and New Construction, respectively

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the project subject to the recommended findings, conditions and Classes 1 and 3 CEQA exemptions.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposed development includes the demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sf addition to the front elevation of the existing 1926 Craftsman style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sf ADU above. The project complies with the development standards of the R-4 zoning district, including the 30’ maximum height limit.

BACKGROUND
Site Description
The approximately 7,014 sq. ft. residential lot is located in an area of Lighthouse Avenue that consists of both single-family and multi-family development. The 1926 Craftsman style residence is not on the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI). In 2013, the owner requested that the Historic Resources Committee (HRC) conduct an Initial Historic Screening for the property. The HRC was unable to determine eligibility for the HRI. A Phase I Historic
Assessment (Attachment B) has subsequently been prepared by a qualified architectural historian which asserts that the property is not a historic resource.

There is a large, multi-trunk Coast live oak in the northwest corner of the property which will be retained and protected through demolition and construction activities. No tree removal is proposed in association with this project.

The property has an approximately 13% average slope with portions of the property at 25%. In order to ensure that grading and drainage requirements are met, the project is conditioned on the receipt of a Grading Permit from the City’s Building Department. At less than 2,500 sq. ft. of new or modified impervious surface, however, a Tier I Stormwater Plan was not required.

**Surrounding Land Uses**
The parcel’s immediate vicinity consists of one- and two-story, single- and multi-family residential uses on similarly-sized lots. The parcel has a 50’ frontage along Lighthouse Avenue.

**DISCUSSION**

**Applicable General Plan Policies**
The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the City. The Land Use Element includes goals and polices that call for the orderly, well-planned, and balanced development, consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the City’s infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. The City’s General Plan Land Use Map designates the subject parcel as Residential High-Density. This designation provides for residential development up to 29 dwelling units per acre. This project helps the City achieve several of its housing goals as stated in the General Plan including in the Residential High-Density land use designation.

The policies of the General Plan and Housing Element are implemented through the R-4 zoning district which allows single- and multi-family development along this portion of the Lighthouse Avenue corridor. Through the addition of an ADU, the project does result in a minor increase in housing units, as supported in the Plan.

**Applicable Zoning Code Regulations**
The proposed project is in full compliance with the zoning regulations set forth in PGMC 23.28 (R-4). This includes and is not limited to the height limit, setback requirements, and allowable site and building coverage. There is no maximum Gross Floor Area (GFA) in the R-3 and R-4 zoning districts. The project is also in compliance with the parking standards for single-family residential development in a multi-family district which requires two covered parking spaces; the proposed ADU does not require parking. This project provides two, one-car garages and some room for additional vehicles in the driveway which will be surfaced with permeable pavers.

**Architecture and Design Consideration**
The proposed addition to the front of the existing house is of a modern style with horizontal cementitious board, stone and stucco siding, and aluminum-clad windows and doors in a bronze finish. A small addition to the rear will utilize similar materials as the existing house which will be substantially retained with existing siding and double-hung windows. The proposed front addition will include white membrane roofing material behind low parapet walls while the
existing house and small rear addition will continue the existing composition shingle roofing. The proposed garage/ADU will mimic the primary residence in style and materials.

The project complies with a variety of the recommendations in the Design Guidelines, including the main guidance regarding neighborhood compatibility, relationship to site and topography, mass and scale, and the use of materials and textures.

The additions to the existing 1,180 sq. ft. residence will result in a 2,139 sq. ft. residence (not including the downstairs garage/workshop), which is not incongruous with the neighborhood. The two-story detached garage/ADU located to the rear of the property, approximately 100’ from the front property line, will likely not be visible from the street. The proposed project’s massing and height fit in with the character of the neighborhood and comply with the following Design Guidelines:

**No. 4 The location and size of the garage should not dominate the street view of the structure.**

The proposed detached two-story garage/ADU will be located to the rear of the property, approximately 100’ from the street, behind the primary residence. It is sited in an area that allows for the protection and retention of the large oak tree.

**No. 7 Second floor balconies and decks should be designed and located to minimize the loss of privacy for neighboring properties.**

No second floor balconies are proposed for the primary residence, but the proposed ADU to be located above the new detached garage will have a small balcony on the north (front) and west sides. This balcony will be 18’ from the west property line and the narrow dimension will be 5’6” from the east property line.

**No. 13 A building should be designed to relate to and take advantage of the natural slope of the land, significant trees and existing vegetation, and any other natural site attributes.**

The site has an average slope of approximately 13% with the steeper areas to the front of the lot. The project includes a significant amount of grading to create a level pad near the front which will accommodate the new addition of a single-car garage below new living space. A portion of the front addition will be cantilevered over the driveway. This design has been reviewed and approved, in concept, by the Building Department.

The placement of the new garage/ADU was chosen in order to retain the large oak tree in the northwest corner of the property.

**No. 15 Open space and landscaped areas should blend visually with adjacent properties.**

See #13 above. PGMC §23.24.060 requires 50% of the front yard to be landscaped. This requirement has been added as a condition of approval.

**No. 21 The design and siting of a dwelling should take into consideration all existing trees in order to avoid unneeded cutting and trimming.**

As mentioned previously, the large Coast live oak tree in the northwest corner of the property will be retained. The project’s conditions of approval include the standard tree protection requirements of Title 12 of the PGMC.

**Privacy Design Guidelines** (Informational Bulletin No. 35) See #7 above.
Landscape & Lighting
In the R-4 zoning district, a minimum of 50% of the front yard is required to be landscaped. This has been added as a condition of approval. In compliance with Design Guidelines No. 10 through No. 12, exterior lighting will be positioned so that no direct light extends onto neighboring properties and the light fixtures will be compatible with the architectural style of the project.

Stormwater Treatment Measure
At less than 2,500 sq. ft. of change in impervious surface, the project does not require a stormwater plan.

Water
Water availability must be established prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the proposed residence. If water is not available, the property will be added to the City’s water wait list.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)
In reviewing this action, the City has followed guidelines adopted by the State of California as published in California Administrative Code, Title 14, §15000, et seq. The proposed project is found to be exempt under the CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(l)(1), Class 1, Demolition of Single-Family Residences, and Section 15303, Class 3, New Construction.

Section 15301, Class 1 consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination. The types of "existing facilities" itemized below are not intended to be all-inclusive of the types of projects which might fall within Class 1. The key consideration is whether the project involves negligible or no expansion of an existing use. Examples include but are not limited to:

(l) Demolition and removal of individual small structures listed in this subdivision;
   (1) One single-family residence. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences may be demolished under this exemption.

Section 15303, Class 3 consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures; and the conversion of existing small structures from one use to another where only minor modifications are made in the exterior of the structure. The numbers of structures described in this section are the maximum allowable on any legal parcel. Examples of this exemption include, but are not limited to:

(a) One single-family residence, or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences may be constructed or converted under this exemption.
The project is not subject to the exceptions to these exemptions per Section 15300.2 of the
CEQA Guidelines relating to location, cumulative impacts, significant effects, scenic
highways, hazardous waste sites, or historical resources.

FINDINGS
Staff recommends if AP 18-0957 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended
findings (see Attachment C, Draft Permit).

CONDITIONS
Staff recommends if AP 18-0957 is approved, the permit must be subject to the recommended
conditions (see Attachment C, Draft Permit).

ATTACHMENTS
A. Application
B. Phase I Historic Assessment
C. Draft Permit
D. Site Plan & Elevations, Project Data Sheet, Materials Board

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: REVIEWED BY:

__________________________     ________________________
Alyson Hunter                  Mark J. Brodeur
Associate Planner              Director, Community & Economic
                                Development Department
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
Community Development Department – Planning Division
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Tel: 831.648.3190 • Fax: 831.648.3184 • www.cityofpacificgrove.org/cedd
Permit Application

Application # AP ADU 18-0957
Date: 10/16/18
Total Fees: $3,589.90

Project Address: 905 LIGHTHOUSE AVE
APN: 006 342 063 000

Project Description:
NEW ADDITION TO EXISTING PRIMARY RESIDENCE
REMOVE EXISTING GARAGE & RECONSTRUCT NEW GARAGE
SECONDARY DWELLING ON TOP

Will the project create, add, or replace impervious surface? ☑ Yes ☐ No
Will the project impact any tree(s) on site? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Applicant
Name: MBA ARCHITECTS/Maria C. C. Almeida
Phone: 408 297.0288 X114
Email: MariaC@maba-architects.net
Mailing Address: 1176 Lincoln Ave
San Jose CA 95125

Owner
Name: Dr. Richard Gallagher
Phone: 408 846.5887
Email: gallowherdentist@gmail.com
Mailing Address: 939 San Benito St.
Hollister CA 95023

Permit Request:
☑ CRD: Counter Determination ☐ AP: Sign Permit
☐ AAP: Administrative AP ☐ UP: Use Permit
☐ ADC: Arch Design Change ☐ AUP: Administrative UP
☐ ASP: Admin Sign Permit ☐ ADU: Acc. Dwelling Unit
☐ LLA: Lot Line Adjustment ☐ VAR: Variance
☐ HPP: Historic Preservation ☐ Stormwater Permit
☐ A: Appeal ☐ Other: ☐ TPD: Tree Permit W/ Dev't
☐ IHS: Initial Historic Screening ☐ EIR: Environmental Impact
☐ MMP: Mitigation Monitoring ☐ Other: ___________

CEQA Determination:
☒ Exempt ☐ Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration
☒ Environmental Impact Report

Review Authority:
☑ Staff ☐ HRC ☐ PC	
☐ ZA ☐ CC ☐ ARB
☐ SPRC ☐ ARB

Active Permits:
☐ Active Planning Permit ☐ Active Building Permit
☐ Active Code Violation Permit #: ___________
☐ Other: ___________
☐ Other: ___________

Overlay Zones:
☐ Butterfly Zone ☐ Coastal Zone
☒ Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS)
☐ Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)

Property Information
Lot: 3
ZC: R-4
☐ Historic Resources Inventory ☐ Archaeologically Sensitive Area
Block: 311
GP: HD to ADU
Tract: PG Acres
Lot Size: 7013 ±

Staff Use Only:
Received by:
Assigned to: ☑

$3,589.90
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INDEMNIFICATION CONDITION

In consideration for City review and approval of application in this matter, the Owner/Applicant shall indemnify, defend, protect and hold harmless the City, its elected and appointed officials, officers, agents, and employees (collectively “Indemnitees”), using counsel approved in writing by the City, from and against, any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements which may accrue against Indemnitees by reason of the City’s processing, approval or denial of the request and application in this matter. Indemnification shall include, but shall not be limited to any action, or proceeding brought to attack, set aside, void, annul, limit, or inhibit the approval of the application referenced above, and shall expressly include causes of action under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The obligation to indemnify shall include, but not be limited to, all costs relating to preparing administrative records, investigations, responses to discovery, retention of experts, and other costs, including attorney’s fees or obligations related to this matter, including actions brought by the Owner/Applicant and also extend to any expense incurred in establishing the City’s right to indemnification. City expenses shall be paid by Owner/Applicant upon City request notwithstanding final disposition of the matter has not yet occurred. If the City is later determined to not be entitled to indemnification, the City shall repay amounts so advanced.

This indemnification condition is the Owner/Applicant’s inducement to the City to process and approve the application, which approval would otherwise be withheld by City due to its concern for liability or expense that may result from performance of the City’s duties. Should any dispute arise regarding interpretation of this condition, the prevailing party shall recover all reasonable costs incurred, including court costs, attorney fees and related expenses. Recovery of expenses shall be as additional costs awarded to the prevailing party, and shall not require initiation of a separate legal proceeding.

This indemnification condition shall not require the Owner/Applicant to indemnify the City or other Indemnities: (a) to the extent that an obligation is actually paid by an insurer pursuant to an insurance policy; (b) in connection with any remuneration paid to the City, if it shall be finally adjudged that such remuneration was in violation of law; or (c) on account of the City’s misconduct if such misconduct shall be finally adjudged to have been knowingly fraudulent, deliberately dishonest or willful.

Any permit or other approval given by the City to the Owner/Applicant Guarantor shall be valid only so long as this indemnification condition is given full force and effect. If this indemnification condition is revoked, the permit or other approval of the City shall then become null and void.

Owner/Applicant represents it (and any subsidiary) is (a) duly formed and organized, (b) validly existing and in good standing under state law, and (c) has all necessary power to execute and deliver this document and perform its obligations. Owner/Applicant also represents it is authorized to enter into this agreement by all requisite partnership, corporate or other action, and its terms are a valid and legally binding obligation. Neither execution nor delivery of this document nor performance of its obligations will violate any law or provision of any agreement, articles of incorporation, by-laws or other organizational or governing documents relating to Owner/Applicant, nor conflict with any court order relating to Owner/Applicant.

Applicant Signature: [Signature]
Date: 6 Nov 2018

Owner Signature (Required): [Signature]
Date: 2 Nov 2018
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### Planning Permit Fee Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit</th>
<th>Select</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Permit – Single Family</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>$2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Architectural Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Design Change</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – no new square footage</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Review &amp; Determination – new square footage</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Historic Screening</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Sign Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit and Amendments – Single Family</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Administrative Use Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Variance and Amendment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Fee</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permit with Development</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Fees

- **General Plan Update Fee**: 5% of Permit Fee - $146.05
- **CEQA Exemption Fee**: $266
- **Butterfly Buffer Zone**: 5% of Permit Fee - $266
- **Coastal Zone**: 25% of Permit Fee - $146.05
- **Area of Special Biological Significance**: 5% of Permit Fee - $146.05
- **Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area**: 15% of Permit Fee - $4.80
- **Noticing – Mailings**: $0.48 * (# of Mailings) - $4.80
- **Noticing – Herald Ad**: $334
- **Stormwater Fee**: Varies
- **County filing fee**: Varies - $50
- **File maintenance fee**: Varies - $50
- **Other**: Varies

**Total Fees**: **$3,583.90**
HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

905 Lighthouse Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA

MBA ARCHITECTS
1176 Lincoln Avenue
San Jose, CA 95125

Marvin Bamburg, AIA, LEED-AP
2018 CHRIS

Maia Gendreau, AIA, CSI, CDT
2018 CHRIS

Research by Urban Programmers
Bonnie Bamburg
905 Lighthouse Avenue - Historic Resource Evaluation

Introduction:

Urban Programmers was asked to provide the historical research and architectural identification for the referenced property, and to compare the history and architecture to the Pacific Grove Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 23.765.025), and the California Register of Historic Resources. We verified that the property is not listed in the Historic Resource Inventory for Pacific Grove, and the only representation we found is in the Historic Context Statement-Final, §D, Pacific Grove Comes of Age 1903-1926, page 117, where it is colored to show construction in 1926. The representative Craftsman style homes, and character-defining features shown in the Historic Context Statement are good examples of the style, with wood or stucco siding, that exhibit the range of characteristics that define the style in Pacific Grove. Comparing the Historic Context Statement description to the house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue allowed the conclusion that the house does not exhibit the quality of architecture identified in the Historic Context Statement as representing the Craftsman style in Pacific Grove. The house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue is a modest double-gable variation of the Craftsman style where a porch extends in front of the main house. Over the years, alterations have changed the front facade to enclose the porch and redesign the stairs as well as a “pop-out” addition. Large skylights have been added into the roof and the rear façade has been given an English Country home appearance with a new door. Yet, in its original design, the house was not an important example of the Craftsman style in Pacific Grove. The property was part of a secondary subdivision of Lot 3 of block 311 in the Pacific Grove Acres. The house and garage were constructed in 1926, when the area had scattered single-family houses on both sides of Lighthouse Avenue. By the 1960s many lots were multi-family buildings and the neighborhood setting had changed. The original and subsequent owners of the property were part of the workforce on the Monterey Peninsula or were retired and some were artists. Research did find any significant associations with events or people who were important in the heritage of Pacific Grove. Attached to this letter is the background evaluation that lead to the determination that the house does not meet the criteria of a significant historic resource in Pacific Grove.
Background, history and architectural description of the property at
905 Lighthouse Avenue

Architectural Description:

Located on Lighthouse Avenue, a main thoroughfare in Pacific Grove, that has a mix of multi-family apartments, Mid-century and period revival houses. The property rises above the street and back about 30 feet is the vernacular Craftsman style house and garage. A multi-family building is adjacent on the west side and a single-family house with a second story addition is on the east at the corner of Alder St. It appears the same builder constructed the subject house and the one next door. Directly across the street are Mid-century box style apartments, and further to the west are Period Revival single-family houses. There is not a pattern of Craftsman style homes in the immediate area of Alder St. and Lighthouse Avenue.

The house and garage at 905 Lighthouse Avenue have concrete foundations and are constructed with a wood frame and covered with smooth surface stucco. The low pitch shingle roof of the house is punctuated with large skylights. The house is constructed on the slope with a partial basement under the front. The space under the building is reduced to a crawl space in the rear. A pair of single-hung windows has been added into the front basement wall. The house is a double gable style, with a projecting gable originally the porch, and the main wall with a larger low–pitch front-facing gable roof. Originally, the projecting gable was an open porch with the front door in the center of the porch wall and sidelights were on each side. The front facade has been remodeled to enclose the porch by adding a framed set of three windows that fill the front wall above a low partial wall. The main entry is now from the side accessed by stairs that were reconstructed to include stepped sections of low walls topped with stone caps. The remodel included adding Irregular shaped stone pieces to cover the stair treads and risers, and a raised “stoop” at the base. This remodel eliminated the porch, placing the entry door at the top of the stairs opening directly into the enlarged living room. A feature of the Craftsman style is “knee braces.” On this house, the oversized, decorative braces are attached at the corners of the roof and wall junction, and in the peak of the roof of the projecting bay. Five more braces are spaced in similar locations on the main building. The front wall of the building is punctuated with a three-part window; two narrow sash on each side of a large fixed center plate glass section. Narrow decorative shutters on each side are typical of all windows, not generally a feature on Craftsman houses. The low-pitched roofs of the projecting gable and
main building have a plain fascia board on the front that has “prongs” added to the ends, in front of open eaves that show the rafters. Open eaves are characteristic of the Craftsman style.

The eaves along the east side of the house have extension boards attached that are not original and may have supported a trellis or awning that is no longer present. The side has double-hung windows fairly equally distributed. The windows are single-pane double-hung styles with a paired set in the middle of the wall. In most Craftsman styles, the windows have a transom or fixed section of small panes at the top. This late era, vernacular building does not have the decorative windows. It is likely the plain style was available and less expensive when the house was constructed. The rear facade has paired double-hung windows on one side, and a single version with the rear door between. The original door has been replaced with a smaller, arched, solid wood style. The west facade is similar to the east facade with the exception the wall has been extended (popped-out) to create a larger interior space at the front of the building. This extension is carried into the front gable and had structurally failed. It was recently reconstructed.

Behind the house is a wood frame garage with a single car-width opening that closes with double hinged cross-braced (barn style), doors that are not the original doors. The garage has a workspace under the same roof and a single door, also a cross braced barn style, is on west side of this facade. The building extends back into the hillside and is partially below the grade at the rear. Two windows are on the rear facade. Mimicking the style of the house, the garage has a low-pitched roof with exposed eaves and oversized “knee braces”.

Landscaping includes random size rock retaining walls in the front yard where the slope requires two terraces, and in the rear to create a patio behind the kitchen. Concrete block is also used for retaining walls in the rear yard. The planting is a mix of vegetation, flowering bushes and trees - none in a particular pattern and many overgrown. The driveway is on the east side of the property and goes straight up the slope to the garage opening.

**Assessment:**

The house was designed in a very common and economical form of the Craftsman style in late 1926. There are similar treatments and window styles in this and the house next door to conclude they were

1 The house was entered into the Assessor’s roll in 1926, but not shown on the 1926 Sanborn Map
designed and constructed by the same builder. Where most of the similar Craftsman Bungalow homes in Pacific Grove are constructed and detailed with a mix of natural materials, wood siding, shingles and natural stone, the subject house does not exhibit those characteristics. Craftsman style houses that were covered in stucco also exhibited style characteristics of battered columns, wide open porches and decorative panel windows. The house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue is a late era vernacular style that exhibits the basics of the style with a double front gable and low-pitched roofs with exposed eaves and decorative “knee braces.” The alteration to the front façade eliminating the porch and creating a side stair with inappropriate materials detracts from the original design. Less obvious is the pop-out addition on the side. **In summary**, the house is not an important architectural resource in Pacific Grove. It is an economical and vernacular version of the Craftsman style. The Historic Context Statement describes buildings that may be significant.

> “Residential buildings from this period may be significant for their architecture, as expressions of these new residential design trends, or as the work of a master architect or prominent builder. Groups of residences may also illustrate larger patterns of residential growth.”

The house and garage at 905 Lighthouse Avenue are not expressions of new residential design trends or the work of a master architect/prominent builder. Nor does the house illustrate a larger pattern of residential growth.

---

2 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, 1906-1926, page 154
Current Photographs:

Photograph 1   905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Front facade taken from Lighthouse Avenue.
Camera Facing: South
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 2  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Front and west facades showing the remodeled former porch and stairs. Note extensions on the rafters.
Camera Facing: Southwest
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 3  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: West façade showing the added north “pop-out” cantilevered from the main building. This was recently reconstructed.
Camera Facing: East
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 5  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Rear and east facade
Camera Facing: South
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017

Photograph 6  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Rear Door
Camera Facing: NW
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Background and History:

The property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue was developed in the Pacific Grove Acres, a subdivision filed on January 2, 1919. At that time, the land facing onto Light House Avenue between Bentley and Alder Streets was reserved as block 311, but was marked “not included” in the filing. The block had already been divided and appears on the map as three parcels. A large parcel in the center and a 100 foot wide lot at the corner of Alder and Lighthouse Avenue (lot 3), and at the opposite corner facing onto Heacock Avenue at Bently St. Lot 3 was split in the 1920s creating two parcels each 50 feet wide. The subject parcel at 905
Lighthouse Avenue is 7,200 square feet, and is located one parcel west of Alder St. on Lighthouse Avenue (formerly Light House Road). By 1926, the Sanborn Map shows Lot 3 had been split and a house constructed at the corner while the subject parcel and most of the lots remained vacant. Houses were located at the corner of Bentley and the corner of Alder St., (903 Lighthouse Avenue). Across the street appear to develop during the 1930s and were enlarged or replaced by apartment buildings in the 1950s-60s. Block 311, was slow to fill-in during the late 1920s, and the houses that were developed have been replaced by multi-family apartment buildings with the exception of the subject property and the house next door at 903 Lighthouse Avenue.

Figure Map of Pacific Grove Acres, c 1919- Arrow shows vacant lot (903-905 Light House Road)
Source: Pacific Grove Historical Context Statement, Page & Turnbull, page 151
When the subject house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue was constructed, the first owner was Robert H. Hooper and his wife Annie A. Hooper.³ Robert was listed in the 1920 San Jose City Director, as a boilermaker living in San Jose. It appears his career changed before moving to Pacific Grove in 1926 where he was listed as a mechanic in the 1928 City Directory for Pacific Grove. During the Depression, the house was vacant and then rented during WWII until 1947, when it was owned by Philip A Cordrey, and shared with Philip A. Cordrey Jr. and Christie Cordrey. In the mid-1950s the property was purchased by Alberto and Patricia Alice Conti.

Alberto Conti achieved success as a concert musician and conductor in Europe before visiting Los Angles in 1928 and emigrating from Italy to Los Angles in 1931. He immediately became the conductor of the Columbia Orchestra Company at Warner Bros. Studios. A popular conductor and musician, he conducted for several opera companies including Los Angles and Portland⁴. His last years in Los Angles he worked with Walt Disney. Maestro Conti may have visited the Pacific Grove while working in Los Angeles, however, his primary residence remained at 4416 Gainsborough Avenue where he lived with his mother-in-law Almira Glascock and wife Patricia Alice Conti.⁵ ⁶ After retiring from Disney Studios, the Contis appear to rent homes in Pacific Grove while their primary home remained in Los Angles until 1954.⁷ The next year, the Conti’s acquired the property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue where they lived for almost 5 years.⁸ During this time, Alberto continued to conduct orchestras around the world. Annie worked for the U.S. Army. In August of 1960, the Contis sold the property to Justine Mace and purchased a house on Guadalupe St. in Carmel.⁹ In addition to his musical training, Alberto studied with the Italian Impressionist, Antonio Piatti. After moving to Carmel he reduced his commitments to travel and focused on his painting. He belonged to the Santa Cruz Art League, Society of Western Artists and the Pacific Grove Art Association. His genre was primarily landscapes and views of the water.

³ R.L. Polk, City Directory Salinas, Monterey and Pacific Grove 1928 page 340
⁶ State of California, United States. Great Register of Voters. Sacramento, California: California State Library.
⁷ Voter rolls for Los Angeles County through 1952.
⁸ No deed was found for the acquisition of Conti.
⁹ Deed; Recorded in Book 2070 Book of Official Records page336
Justine Mace and her husband James, an engineer at Firestone, lived at 1067 Morse Drive in Pacific Grove in 1957. After leaving Firestone James became an instructor at San Jose State College, where the family lived on Meredith Avenue, in San Jose and rented or vacationed in the house in Pacific Grove. As a widow in 1980, Justine returned to live in the house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue.\textsuperscript{10} A year later, the property sold to Walter W. and Joan B. Bernard. Walter worked as a tile contractor for C.L. Frost, Inc., a supplier and installer of stone and tile with offices in Sand City. It appears the remodel of the front porch and stairs occurred during the time the Bernards owned the property. A year later, the property sold to John P. and Harriet D. Dowling who moved from Laurel Street in Monterey to the Pacific Grove property. The property was transferred in 2011, from John P Dowling Jr. to Dorothy Elaine Dowling, who created a trust ownership in 2012. As the trustee, she sold the property to Roger W. and Evelyn M Gallagher in April 2013. Their son, Dr. Gallagher is the current trustee of the family trust that owns the property.

**Summary:**
The owners of the property have been members of the workforce, were semi-retired or retired. The only person with a reputation was, Alberto Conti who owned the house for a short time while he was traveling the world to conduct operas. His ownership does not contribute in a significant way to the history of Pacific Grove. None of the owners/residents was found to be influential in the history or culture of Pacific Grove.

**Regulatory Framework:**
To comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, the Lead Agency, The City of Pacific Grove must consider buildings over 50 years of age to be potential historic resources until shown they do not to meet the criteria of the California Register of Historic Resources or the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Landmark Criteria.

In 2011, the City of Pacific Grove adopted the Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement. This provides the historic background and architectural history that allows for comparison of the history and architectural styles of individual properties to those events, people and architecture that were important in developing the heritage of the community. The chapter in the Historical Context Statement that describes the period of 1926, when the subject buildings were constructed is era “Pacific Grove Comes of Age 1903-1926.”

\textsuperscript{10} 1980 City Directory for Pacific Grove
Two themes were specifically considered in this evaluation; architecture/development and culture (artists) of Pacific Grove during the 1950s.

The mid-1920s saw a change in residential development with the inclusion of stucco siding for revival styles and on some Craftsman style houses. This was a variation from the traditional craftsman style that used natural materials, wood siding and shingles, and often river rock. Stucco was an economical material that became important for its ease of application and in the construction of Monterey Colonial, Mission, and the most popular, Mediterranean revival styles. As lot splits and subdivisions provided smaller lots, the homes were often built by developers constructing 4 or more very similar styles in a line. This type of development often portrayed the progression from individual parcels to small, 2 to 4 lot, developments, and then larger tracts of houses.

The Pacific Grove Historical Context Statement includes, “The overwhelming majority of surviving buildings constructed between 1903 and 1926 are single-family residences designed in period revival styles that represented a dramatic shift from earlier eras—most easily recognized by a transition from wood to stucco cladding.”

The Craftsman style emanated from the Arts and Crafts movement and is closely identified with the Green brothers and their landmark houses in Southern California. In modest houses, the style retained some decorative elements from the structure of the antecedent buildings, usually mixed materials of wood siding, shingles and river rock. Open porches that often had battered columns were also common. Open porches, knee braces, exposed eaves and wood frames around the windows are the most common elements to carry onto stucco clad houses.

The Pacific Grove Historical Context Statement describes the typical Craftsman having the following features:

---

11 Historical context Statement-Final, Pacific Grove Comes of Age, page 116
“For this and the less grand homes the characteristics are:

♣ Simple rectangular massing
♣ Front or side gable roofs with prominent knee braces and exposed rafter tails
♣ Wood shingle, bevel, novelty or shiplap siding (sometimes in combination) are most common
♣ Gable porches supported by “battered” columns which are wider at the base
♣ Windows with geometric division in the upper sash ♣ Smooth river boulders as skirting, or at the base of chimneys”  

12 Historical Context Statement-Final Pacific Grove Comes of Age, page 172
City of Pacific Grove, Municipal Code Chapter 23.76 HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Zoning Chapter 23; Section 23.76.025 Evaluation criteria.

The following shall be utilized as criteria as required in this chapter.

(a) Whether the structure has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city of Pacific Grove, the state of California, or the United States;

The house is a very modest version of a Craftsman style Bungalow. Constructed in 1926, it does not have significant character or value in depicting the development heritage of Pacific Grove, the state of California or the United States. The property was a speculative house constructed as half of a lot split and two-parcel development.

(b) Whether it is the site of a significant historic event;

Research did not uncover any historical events associated with the property.

(c) Whether it is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove;

The house is not strongly identified with a person who significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove. Most of the occupants identified with the property were part of the workforce or were retired. Alberto Conti (1895-1982) an internationally recognized musician and conductor, owned the house from c.1955-1960. During this period, he traveled extensively to conduct orchestras for several opera companies. Mr. Conti lived in Los Angeles during most of his musical career. In 1960, he reduced his conducting engagements and purchased a home on Guadalupe Drive in Carmel where he emerged as a respected local artist. He lived in Carmel from 1960 until his death in 1982. Because he traveled extensively while he owned the Lighthouse property and moved to Carmel before achieving stature as an artist, he is not strongly identified with Pacific Grove.

(d) Whether it is a particularly good example of a period or style;

The house is a vernacular design of the Craftsman style. It was constructed by a carpenter/builder/developer, and is not a particularly good example of a Craftsman style. Alterations have further diminished the design of the building.

(e) Whether it is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pacific Grove possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;
There are many iterations of the stucco covered Craftsman style homes in Pacific Grove.

(f) Whether it is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city of Pacific Grove;

The house was not designed by a notable architect. Most likely, a carpenter/builder designed and constructed the house.

(g) Whether it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation;

The house is common construction and does not exhibit innovation in the design or construction.

(h) Whether it has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or of the city of Pacific Grove;

The location is not a unique site and the house, set back from the road, does not exhibit singular physical characterizes that are a familiar features in the neighborhood.

(i) Whether it retains the integrity of the original design;

The vernacular design retains the overall form of the original 1926 plan with double gable, low-pitched roofs, and decorative knee braces. Alterations to the front façade have removed the front porch and enlarged to facade. Other alterations have occurred to the rear and west side of the house.

(j) Whether it contributes to the architectural aesthetics and continuity of the street;

There is little continuity or architectural aesthetics in this part of Lighthouse Avenue. Multi-family buildings have replaced the pre-1930 single-family homes, yet it is unlikely this block ever had continuity or aesthetics because the development history shows a variety of in-fill building between the corner properties.

(k) Whether it is located within a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic properties which visually contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically. [Ord. 01-25 § 1, 2001; Ord. 97-23 § 1, 1997].

The 900 block of Lighthouse Avenue is not within a definable area possessing concentration of historic properties.
Conclusion:
When compared to the criteria contained in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code Section 23.76.025 the property and improvements are not described by the criteria. The house and garage at 905 Lighthouse Avenue do not qualify as a historic resource in Pacific Grove.

California Register of Historic Resources

The State Historical Resources Commission has designed this program for use by state and local agencies, private groups and citizens to identify, evaluate, register and protect California's historical resources. The Register is the authoritative guide to the state's significant historical and archeological resources.

The California Register program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archeological and cultural significance, identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes, determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Criteria for Designation

Criterion 1  Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
Criterion 2  Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.
Criterion 3  Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
Criterion 4  Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

To be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources must retain sufficient integrity to communicate the reason for its significance.

The historical documentation and description of the property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue are the basis for the following consideration of each of the criteria for designation to the California Register of Historic Resources.
1. The property is not associated with significant events that have contributed to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. The property is part of a large subdivision of land that was originally owned by Southern Pacific Rail Road Company and transferred to a new entity Pacific Grove Improvement Company when the subdivision of Pacific Grove Acres was recorded in 1919. At that time, the parcel appears to be vacant. In 1926, a house and garage were constructed. The property has been a single-family residence since then. No events of significance are associated with the subject property.

2. The property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue was not found to have a significant association with persons important in local, California or national history. For a period of about five years, it was the home of Alberto Conti, a well-known musician and orchestra conductor. During this time, Maestro Conti traveled extensively conducting for opera companies in the United States and Europe. His career was mostly spent in Los Angles and a second career as an artist was in Carmel. He is not considered to have been an important person in Pacific Grove’s history.

3. The architecture exhibits a vernacular design of a Craftsman (stucco covered) style. The original house was not a fine example of the style and alterations have further eroded the original design. It does not embody distinctive characteristics of the type, period, region or method of construction in an important way. The buildings are not the work of a master and do not possess high artistic values.

4. The excavation and construction of the house, garage, driveway, retaining walls and patios have removed the native soil from most of the property. It is unlikely that the property would yield significant information in history or prehistory.

Conclusion:
The property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue does not meet any of the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.
ARCHITECTURAL PERMIT (AP) AND ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT PERMIT (ADU) 18-0957
FOR THE REMODEL OF AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE, DEMOLITION OF AN
EXISTING GARAGE, AND DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW DETACHED ONE-CAR GARAGE WITH
A SECOND- STORY ADU AT 905 LIGHTHOUSE AVENUE.

FACTS
1. The subject site is located at 905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove, 93950 (APN 006-342-003)
2. The subject site has a designation of Residential High Density on the adopted City of Pacific Grove General
Plan Land Use Map. This designation allows a density up to 29 dwelling units per acre.
3. The project site is located in the Residential Multi-Family zoning district (R-4).
4. The subject site is approximately 7,014 sq. ft. in size.
5. The subject site is currently developed with an approximately 1,180 sq. ft. residence and a detached 336 sq.
   ft. garage.
6. The subject site is not located in the Coastal zone, the Archaeological sensitivity zone, nor is it included on
   the City’s Historic Resources Inventory, but it is within the Area of Special Biological Significance.
7. The existing development received a recommendation of “determination of ineligibility cannot be made” by
   the Historic Resources Committee (HRC) in August 2013. As a result, the owner had a Phase I Historic
   Assessment conducted by a qualified historian which resulted in a finding of ineligibility for the HRI.
8. This project has been determined to be CEQA Exempt under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301(l),
   Residential Demolition, and Section 15303(a), New Residential Development.

FINDINGS
Architectural Permits are subject to the following findings per PGMC Section 23.70.060(f):
1. The architecture and general appearance of the completed project are compatible with the neighborhood;
2. The completed project will neither be detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the city nor
   impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and
3. The board has been guided by and has made reference to applicable provisions of the architectural review
   guidelines in making its determinations on the structure.

The architectural style and materials, and site design are in substantial conformance to the City’s Residential
Design Guidelines, specifically Nos. 4, 7, 13, 15, and 21 relating to the site’s natural setting, high quality
materials and finishes, and neighborhood compatibility, and Nos. 10-12 relating to exterior lighting.

Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are subject to the development standards per PGMC Section
23.80.060 which does not include specific findings.

The proposed demolition and new construction are in compliance with the development standards of the R-4
zoning district and general plan. No exceptions are requested.

PERMIT
Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957: The proposed development includes the
demolition of an existing detached garage, the remodel of and 1,284 sf addition to the existing 1926 Craftsman
style residence, and a new single-car detached garage with a 550 sf ADU above. The project complies with the
development standards of the R-4 zoning district.
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. **Permit Expiration.** This permit shall expire and be null and void if a building permit has not been applied for within one (1) year from and after the date of approval. Application for extension of this approval must be made prior to the expiration date.

2. **Demolition Permit.** A demolition permit from the Building Department is required prior to any demolition activities on the site.

3. **Construction Compliance.** All construction must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application, subject to any special conditions of approval herein. Any deviation from approvals must be reviewed and approved by staff, and may require Architectural Review Board approval.

4. **Terms and Conditions.** These terms and conditions shall run with the land, and it is the intention of the Community and Economic Development Director and the Permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions, unless amended. Amendments to this permit may be achieved only if an application is made and approved, pursuant to the Zoning Code.

5. **Archaeological Resources.** If archaeological resources or human remains are unexpectedly discovered during construction, work shall be halted on the project parcel until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated, with the approval of the lead agency, and implemented.

6. **Rock Wall.** The existing rock wall along the front property line shall be retained and repaired as feasible.

7. **Tree Protection Standards During Construction.** Pursuant to Municipal Code Chapters 12.20 and 12.30, and the *Urban Forestry Standards*, all trees that are otherwise protected and will be impacted as a result of Development, both proposed for pruning or removal and where the development will impact the critical root zone of the tree are protected. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the Project Arborist shall review grading, drainage, utility, building and landscape plans to determine impacts to individual Trees, to determine required minimum Tree protection standards during construction and submit a report to the City Arborist for review and approval.

8. **Grading Permit.** The applicant shall prepare an engineered grading plan for submittal to the Building Department. The plan shall include the depository for the any cut materials that will not be used elsewhere onsite.

9. **Landscaping.** Prior to the final Planning inspection, the application shall provide a landscaping plan for a minimum of 50% of the front yard as required by PGMC §23.24.060. The plan shall include the plant palette, irrigation, and maintenance schedule. The plan shall refer to the City’s Landscape Guidelines & Planting Palette.

10. **Public Works, Fire and Building.** Review and approval by the Public Works, Fire and Building Departments are required prior to issuance of a building permit. Work taking place in the public right-of-way, including the development of a new residential driveway and the relocation of the existing PG&E guy wires, shall require an encroachment permit prior to issuance of the building permit.

11. **Building Plans.** All conditions of approval for the Planning Permit(s) shall be printed on a full size sheet and included with the construction plan set submitted to the Building Department.

12. **Exterior Lighting.** All exterior lighting fixtures shall conform to Architectural Review Guidelines #10-#12.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE:

1. The Board determines that each of the Findings set forth above is true and correct, and by this reference incorporates those Findings as an integral part of this Permit.

2. The Board authorizes Approval of Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957 through the adoption of CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemptions, Section 15301(1), Class 1, Demolition of Single-Family Residences, and Section 15303(a), Class 3, New Construction.

3. This permit shall become effective upon the expiration of the 10-day appeal period.

4. This permit shall not take effect until the owner acknowledges and agrees to all terms and conditions and agrees to conform to and comply with those terms and conditions.

PASSED AND ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE ON THE 8th DAY OF JANUARY, 2019, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTENTIONS:  APPROVED:

_______________________________

Sarah Boyle, Chair

The undersigned hereby acknowledge and agree to the approved terms and conditions, and agree to fully conform to, and comply with, said terms and conditions.

__________________________________________  __________________________
Richard Gallagher, owner  Date
**PROJECT DATA SHEET**

**PROJECT ADDRESS:** 905 Lighthouse Ave

**APPLICANT:** MBA Architects

**PERMIT TYPE:** ARB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone District</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PERMITTED</th>
<th>EXISTING CONDITION</th>
<th>PROPOSED CONDITION</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross Floor Area**

- **1180 sf + 336 = 1516 sf**

**Square Footage not counted toward Gross Floor Area**

- **41 sf cantilevered**

**Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be demolished in feet & % of total**

- **767 sf (42%)**

**Exterior Lateral Wall Length to be built**

- **3173 sf net**

**Building Height**

- **30'**

**Number of Stories**

- **3**

**Front Setback**

- **12'**

**East Setback**

- **10% of width (47') 5'7" 5' min.**

**West Setback**

- **10% of width (47') 10'6'**

**Rear Setback**

- **8'72'65'**

**Uncovered Parking Spaces**

- **1**

**Parking Space size**

- **9x20'**

**No. of Driveways**

- **1**

**Driveway width**

- **10' min.**

**Open Porch/Deck Projections**

- **3' to PL NONE NONE**

**ARCHITECTURAL FEATURE PROJECTION**

- **3' max from PL NONE NONE**

**Number and Category of Accessory Buildings**

- **1 - GARAGE AND SECONDARY DWELLING**

**Accessory Building Setbacks**

- **min 5' side and 8" rear for ADU over garage & 2 garage west side 45° to rear & 7'6" west side 7' to rear**

**Distance Between Buildings**

- **8' between eaves & 8' between house & proposed clear between porch at ADU and eave at primary residence**

**PROPOSED EXTERIOR COVERAGE**

- **9x20'**

**Fence Height**

- **6'**

---

**LENS**

**GROSS BUILDING AREA MAIN LEVEL**

**GROSS BUILDING AREA LOWER LEVEL**

**BUILDINGS COVERAGE PLAN**

**EXISTING INTERIOR COVERAGE**

**PROPOSED INTERIOR COVERAGE**
COLOR/MATERIAL SCHEDULE:
DUN EDWARDS PAINTS

CEMENTOUS SIDING:

PAINTED:
DE6153 PYRAMID

A. ARTISAN LAP SIDING BY JAMES HARDIE

STUCCO

B. MATCH (E)
DE6222 POROUS STONE

CAST STONE VENEER

COMPOSITION SHINGLES
ROOFING

C. ELDRADO'S SARATOGA
RUSTIC LEDGE

D. CERTAINTEED LANDMARK
GRAPHITE

SINGLE PLY ROOFING
MEMBRANE

E. DURO-LAST - WHITE

CLAD WOOD WINDOW & DOOR
W/ EXTRUCED ALUMINUM EXTERIOR FINISHED

GALLAGHER RESIDENCE
305 LIGHTHOUSE AVE.
PACIFIC GROVE, CA
Errata begins on next page
TO: Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board
FROM: Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
MEETING DATE: February 12, 2019
SUBJECT: Architectural Review Board Meeting Agenda - Errata Sheet

Please note that this item was continued from the January 8th ARB agenda. The agenda report and supporting documents from the January 8th packet are to be used, in addition to the new information received since that date included here, in the ARB’s review and consideration of this project.

Attached is additional information for your consideration at the February 12, 2019, Architectural Review Board Meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Information Provided/Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8d – 905 Lighthouse Ave. | (Attachment 1) Revised Historic Assessment - the revision is to the evaluation criteria to comply with current regulations  
(Attachment 2) Revised Sheet C1 Showing Driveway Turning Radius  
(Attachment 3) Letters from Public Members  
(Attachment 4) Revised Sheets GO, A1, A4, A5 (received 1/23/19) |

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Alyson Hunter

Alyson Hunter, Associate Planner
905 Lighthouse Avenue - Historic Resource Evaluation

Introduction:

Urban Programmers was asked to provide the historical research and architectural identification for the referenced property, and to compare the history and architecture to the Pacific Grove Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 23.765.025), and the California Register of Historic Resources. We verified that the property is not listed in the Historic Resource Inventory for Pacific Grove, and the only representation we found is in the Historic Context Statement-Final, §D, Pacific Grove Comes of Age 1903-1926, page 117, where it is colored to show construction in 1926. The representative Craftsman style homes, and character-defining features shown in the Historic Context Statement are good examples of the style, with wood or stucco siding, that exhibit the range of characteristics that define the style in Pacific Grove. Comparing the Historic Context Statement description to the house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue allowed the conclusion that the house does not exhibit the quality of architecture identified in the Historic Context Statement as representing the Craftsman style in Pacific Grove. The house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue is a modest double-gable variation of the Craftsman style where a porch extends in front of the main house. Over the years, alterations have changed the front facade to enclose the porch and redesign the stairs as well as a “pop-out” addition. Large skylights have been added into the roof and the rear façade has been given an English Country home appearance with a new door. Yet, in its original design, the house was not an important example of the Craftsman style in Pacific Grove. The property was part of a secondary subdivision of Lot 3 of block 311 in the Pacific Grove Acres. The house and garage were constructed in 1926, when the area had scattered single-family houses on both sides of Lighthouse Avenue. By the 1960s many lots were multi-family buildings and the neighborhood setting had changed. The original and subsequent owners of the property were part of the workforce on the Monterey Peninsula or were retired and some were artists. Research did find any significant associations with events or people who were important in the heritage of Pacific Grove. Attached to this letter is the background evaluation that lead to the determination that the house does not meet the criteria of a significant historic resource in Pacific Grove.
Background, history and architectural description of the property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue

Architectural Description:

Located on Lighthouse Avenue, a main thoroughfare in Pacific Grove, that has a mix of multi-family apartments, Mid-century and period revival houses. The property rises above the street and back about 30 feet is the vernacular Craftsman style house and garage. A multi-family building is adjacent on the west side and a single-family house with a second story addition is on the east at the corner of Alder St. It appears the same builder constructed the subject house and the one next door. Directly across the street are Mid-century box style apartments, and further to the west are Period Revival single-family houses. There is not a pattern of Craftsman style homes in the immediate area of Alder St. and Lighthouse Avenue. The house and garage at 905 Lighthouse Avenue have concrete foundations and are constructed with a wood frame and covered with smooth surface stucco. The low pitch shingle roof of the house is punctuated with large skylights. The house is constructed on the slope with a partial basement under the front. The space under the building is reduced to a crawl space in the rear. A pair of single-hung windows has been added into the front basement wall. The house is a double gable style, with a projecting gable originally the porch, and the main wall with a larger low–pitch front-facing gable roof. Originally, the projecting gable was an open porch with the front door in the center of the porch wall and sidelights were on each side. The front facade has been remodeled to enclose the porch by adding a framed set of three windows that fill the front wall above a low partial wall. The main entry is now from the side accessed by stairs that were reconstructed to include stepped sections of low walls topped with stone caps. The remodel included adding Irregular shaped stone pieces to cover the stair treads and risers, and a raised “stoop” at the base. This remodel eliminated the porch, placing the entry door at the top of the stairs opening directly into the enlarged living room. A feature of the Craftsman style is “knee braces.” On this house, the oversized, decorative braces are attached at the corners of the roof and wall junction, and in the peak of the roof of the projecting bay. Five more braces are spaced in similar locations on the main building. The front wall of the building is punctuated with a three-part window; two narrow sash on each side of a large fixed center plate glass section. Narrow decorative shutters on each side are typical of all windows, not generally a feature on Craftsman houses. The low-pitched roofs of the projecting gable and
main building have a plain fascia board on the front that has “prongs” added to the ends, in front of open
eaves that show the rafters. Open eaves are characteristic of the Craftsman style.

The eaves along the east side of the house have extension boards attached that are not original and may
have supported a trellis or awning that is no longer present. The side has double-hung windows fairly
equally distributed. The windows are single-pane double-hung styles with a paired set in the middle of the
wall. In most Craftsman styles, the windows have a transom or fixed section of small panes at the top. This
late era, vernacular building does not have the decorative windows. It is likely the plain style was available
and less expensive when the house was constructed. The rear facade has paired double-hung windows on
one side, and a single version with the rear door between. The original door has been replaced with a
smaller, arched, solid wood style. The west facade is similar to the east facade with the exception the wall
has been extended (popped-out) to create a larger interior space at the front of the building. This
extension is carried into the front gable and had structurally failed. It was recently reconstructed.

Behind the house is a wood frame garage with a single car-width opening that closes with double hinged
cross-braced (barn style), doors that are not the original doors. The garage has a workspace under the
same roof and a single door, also a cross braced barn style, is on west side of this facade. The building
extends back into the hillside and is partially below the grade at the rear. Two windows are on the rear
facade. Mimicking the style of the house, the garage has a low-pitched roof with exposed eaves and
oversized “knee braces”.

Landscaping includes random size rock retaining walls in the front yard where the slope requires two
terraces, and in the rear to create a patio behind the kitchen. Concrete block is also used for retaining
walls in the rear yard. The planting is a mix of vegetation, flowering bushes and trees - none in a particular
pattern and many overgrown. The driveway is on the east side of the property and goes straight up the
slope to the garage opening.

Assessment:
The house was designed in a very common and economical form of the Craftsman style in late 1926.¹
There are similar treatments and window styles in this and the house next door to conclude they were

¹ The house was entered into the Assessor’s roll in 1926, but not shown on the 1926 Sanborn Map
designed and constructed by the same builder. Where most of the similar Craftsman Bungalow homes in Pacific Grove are constructed and detailed with a mix of natural materials, wood siding, shingles and natural stone, the subject house does not exhibit those characteristics. Craftsman style houses that were covered in stucco also exhibited style characteristics of battered columns, wide open porches and decorative panel windows. The house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue is a late era vernacular style that exhibits the basics of the style with a double front gable and low-pitched roofs with exposed eaves and decorative “knee braces.” The alteration to the front façade eliminating the porch and creating a side stair with inappropriate materials detracts from the original design. Less obvious is the pop-out addition on the side. In summary, the house is not an important architectural resource in Pacific Grove. It is an economical and vernacular version of the Craftsman style. The Historic Context Statement describes buildings that may be significant.

“Residential buildings from this period may be significant for their architecture, as expressions of these new residential design trends, or as the work of a master architect or prominent builder. Groups of residences may also illustrate larger patterns of residential growth.”

The house and garage at 905 Lighthouse Avenue are not expressions of new residential design trends or the work of a master architect/prominent builder. Nor does the house illustrate a larger pattern of residential growth.

---

2 Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement, 1906-1926, page 154
Current Photographs:

Photograph 1  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Front facade taken from Lighthouse Avenue.
Camera Facing: South
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 2  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Front and west facades showing the remodeled former porch and stairs. Note extensions on the rafters.
Camera Facing: Southwest
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 3  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: West façade showing the added north “pop-out” cantilevered from the main building. This was recently reconstructed.
Camera Facing: East
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 5  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Rear and east facade
Camera Facing: South
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017

Photograph 6  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Rear Door
Camera Facing: NW
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017
Photograph 8  905 Lighthouse Avenue, Pacific Grove
View: Front facade of the garage. Barn style doors are replacements
Camera Facing: South
Date of Photograph: July 21, 2017

Background and History:
The property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue was developed in the Pacific Grove Acres, a subdivision filed on January 2, 1919. At that time, the land facing onto Light House Avenue between Bentley and Alder Streets was reserved as block 311, but was marked “not included” in the filing. The block had already been divided and appears on the map as three parcels. A large parcel in the center and a 100 foot wide lot at the corner of Alder and Lighthouse Avenue (lot 3), and at the opposite corner facing onto Heacock Avenue at Bently St. Lot 3 was split in the 1920s creating two parcels each 50 feet wide. The subject parcel at 905
Lighthouse Avenue is 7,200 square feet, and is located one parcel west of Alder St. on Lighthouse Avenue (formerly Light House Road). By 1926, the Sanborn Map shows Lot 3 had been split and a house constructed at the corner while the subject parcel and most of the lots remained vacant. Houses were located at the corner of Bentley and the corner of Alder St., (903 Lighthouse Avenue). Across the street appear to develop during the 1930s and were enlarged or replaced by apartment buildings in the 1950s-60s. Block 311, was slow to fill-in during the late 1920s, and the houses that were developed have been replaced by multi-family apartment buildings with the exception of the subject property and the house next door at 903 Lighthouse Avenue.

Figure  Map of Pacific Grove Acres, c 1919- Arrow shows vacant lot (903-905 Light House Road)
Source: Pacific Grove Historical Context Statement, Page & Turnbull, page 151
When the subject house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue was constructed, the first owner was Robert H. Hooper and his wife Annie A. Hooper.¹ Robert was listed in the 1920 San Jose City Director, as a boilermaker living in San Jose. It appears his career changed before moving to Pacific Grove in 1926 where he was listed as a mechanic in the 1928 City Directory for Pacific Grove. During the Depression, the house was vacant and then rented during WWII until 1947, when it was owned by Philip A Cordrey, and shared with Philip A. Cordrey Jr. and Christie Cordrey. In the mid-1950s the property was purchased by Alberto and Patricia Alice Conti.

Alberto Conti achieved success as a concert musician and conductor in Europe before visiting Los Angeles in 1928 and emigrating from Italy to Los Angeles in 1931. He immediately became the conductor of the Columbia Orchestra Company at Warner Bros. Studios. A popular conductor and musician, he conducted for several opera companies including Los Angles and Portland². His last years in Los Angeles he worked with Walt Disney. Maestro Conti may have visited the Pacific Grove while working in Los Angeles, however, his primary residence remained at 4416 Gainsborough Avenue where he lived with his mother-in-law Almira Glascock and wife Patricia Alice Conti.³ ⁴ After retiring from Disney Studios, the Contis appear to rent homes in Pacific Grove while their primary home remained in Los Angles until 1954.⁵ The next year, the Conti’s acquired the property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue where they lived for almost 5 years.⁶ During this time, Alberto continued to conduct orchestras around the world. Annie worked for the U.S. Army. In August of 1960, the Contis sold the property to Justine Mace and purchased a house on Guadalupe St. in Carmel.⁷ In addition to his musical training, Alberto studied with the Italian Impressionist, Antonio Piatti. After moving to Carmel he reduced his commitments to travel and focused on his painting. He belonged to the Santa Cruz Art League, Society of Western Artists and the Pacific Grove Art Association. His genre was primarily landscapes and views of the water.

³ R.L. Polk, City Directory Salinas, Monterey and Pacific Grove 1928 page 340
⁶ State of California, United States. Great Register of Voters. Sacramento, California: California State Library.
⁷ Voter rolls for Los Angeles County through 1952.
⁸ No deed was found for the acquisition of Conti.
⁹ Deed; Recorded in Book 2070 Book of Official Records page336
Justine Mace and her husband James, an engineer at Firestone, lived at 1067 Morse Drive in Pacific Grove in 1957. After leaving Firestone James became an instructor at San Jose State College, where the family lived on Meredith Avenue, in San Jose and rented or vacationed in the house in Pacific Grove. As a widow in 1980, Justine returned to live in the house at 905 Lighthouse Avenue.\(^{10}\) A year later, the property sold to Walter W. and Joan B. Bernard. Walter worked as a tile contractor for C.L. Frost, Inc., a supplier and installer of stone and tile with offices in Sand City. It appears the remodel of the front porch and stairs occurred during the time the Bernards owned the property. A year later, the property sold to John P. and Harriet D. Dowling who moved from Laurel Street in Monterey to the Pacific Grove property. The property was transferred in 2011, from John P Dowling Jr. to Dorothy Elaine Dowling, who created a trust ownership in 2012. As the trustee, she sold the property to Roger W. and Evelyn M Gallagher in April 2013. Their son, Dr. Gallagher is the current trustee of the family trust that owns the property.

**Summary:**

The owners of the property have been members of the workforce, were semi-retired or retired. The only person with a reputation was, Alberto Conti who owned the house for a short time while he was traveling the world to conduct operas. His ownership does not contribute in a significant way to the history of Pacific Grove. None of the owners/residents was found to be influential in the history or culture of Pacific Grove.

**Regulatory Framework:**

To comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, the Lead Agency, The City of Pacific Grove must consider buildings over 50 years of age to be potential historic resources until shown they do not to meet the criteria of the California Register of Historic Resources or the City of Pacific Grove’s Historic Landmark Criteria.

In 2011, the City of Pacific Grove adopted the Pacific Grove Historic Context Statement. This provides the historic background and architectural history that allows for comparison of the history and architectural styles of individual properties to those events, people and architecture that were important in developing the heritage of the community. The chapter in the Historical Context Statement that describes the period of 1926, when the subject buildings were constructed is era “Pacific Grove Comes of Age 1903-1926.”

\(^{10}\) 1980 City Directory for Pacific Grove
Two themes were specifically considered in this evaluation; architecture/development and culture (artists) of Pacific Grove during the 1950s.

The mid-1920s saw a change in residential development with the inclusion of stucco siding for revival styles and on some Craftsman style houses. This was a variation from the traditional craftsman style that used natural materials, wood siding and shingles, and often river rock. Stucco was an economical material that became important for its ease of application and in the construction of Monterey Colonial, Mission, and the most popular, Mediterranean revival styles. As lot splits and subdivisions provided smaller lots, the homes were often built by developers constructing 4 or more very similar styles in a line. This type of development often portrayed the progression from individual parcels to small, 2 to 4 lot, developments, and then larger tracts of houses.

The Pacific Grove Historical Context Statement includes, “The overwhelming majority of surviving buildings constructed between 1903 and 1926 are single-family residences designed in period revival styles that represented a dramatic shift from earlier eras—most easily recognized by a transition from wood to stucco cladding.”

The Craftsman style emanated from the Arts and Crafts movement and is closely identified with the Green brothers and their landmark houses in Southern California. In modest houses, the style retained some decorative elements from the structure of the antecedent buildings, usually mixed materials of wood siding, shingles and river rock. Open porches that often had battered columns were also common. Open porches, knee braces, exposed eaves and wood frames around the windows are the most common elements to carry onto stucco clad houses.

The Pacific Grove Historical Context Statement describes the typical Craftsman having the following features:

---

11 Historic context Statement-Final, Pacific Grove Comes of Age, page 116
“For this and the less grand homes the characteristics are:

♣ Simple rectangular massing
♣ Front or side gable roofs with prominent knee braces and exposed rafter tails
♣ Wood shingle, bevel, novelty or shiplap siding (sometimes in combination) are most common
♣ Gable porches supported by “battered” columns which are wider at the base
♣ Windows with geometric division in the upper sash ♣ Smooth river boulders as skirting, or at the base of chimneys” 12

12 Historical Context Statement-Final Pacific Grove Comes of Age, page 172
(a) Whether the structure has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city of Pacific Grove, the state of California, or the United States;

The house is a very modest version of a Craftsman style Bungalow. Constructed in 1926, it does not have significant character or value in depicting the development heritage of Pacific Grove, the state of California or the United States. The property was a speculative house constructed as half of a lot split and two-parcel development.

(b) Whether it is the site of a significant historic event;

Research did not uncover any historical events associated with the property.

(c) Whether it is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove;

The house is not strongly identified with a person who significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city of Pacific Grove. Most of the occupants identified with the property were part of the workforce or were retired. Alberto Conti (1895-1982) an internationally recognized musician and conductor, owned the house from c.1955-1960. During this period, he traveled extensively to conduct orchestras for several opera companies. Mr. Conti lived in Los Angeles during most of his musical career. In 1960, he reduced his conducting engagements and purchased a home on Guadalupe Drive in Carmel where he emerged as a respected local artist. He lived in Carmel from 1960 until his death in 1982. Because he traveled extensively while he owned the Lighthouse property and moved to Carmel before achieving stature as an artist, he is not strongly identified with Pacific Grove.

(d) Whether it is a particularly good example of a period or style;

The house is a vernacular design of the Craftsman style. It was constructed by a carpenter/builder/developer, and is not a particularly good example of a Craftsman style. Alterations have further diminished the design of the building.

(e) Whether it is one of the few remaining examples in the city of Pacific Grove possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen;
There are many iterations of the stucco covered Craftsman style homes in Pacific Grove.

(f) Whether it is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city of Pacific Grove;

   The house was not designed by a notable architect. Most likely, a carpenter/builder designed and constructed the house.

(g) Whether it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation;

   The house is common construction and does not exhibit innovation in the design or construction.

(h) Whether it has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or of the city of Pacific Grove;

   The location is not a unique site and the house, set back from the road, does not exhibit singular physical characteristics that are a familiar feature in the neighborhood.

(i) Whether a resource with historical or cultural significance retains historic integrity.

   905 Lighthouse is lacking in historic or cultural significance. It is a modest Craftsman style home that has been altered and added to several times, which has impacted its integrity.

Conclusion:

When compared to the criteria contained in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code Section 23.76.025 the property and improvements are not described by the criteria. The house and garage at 905 Lighthouse Avenue do not qualify as a historic resource in Pacific Grove.

California Register of Historic Resources

The State Historical Resources Commission has designed this program for use by state and local agencies, private groups and citizens to identify, evaluate, register and protect California's historical resources. The Register is the authoritative guide to the state's significant historical and archeological resources.

The California Register program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archeological and cultural significance, identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes, determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act.
Criteria for Designation

Criterion 1  Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
Criterion 2  Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.
Criterion 3  Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
Criterion 4  Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

To be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources must retain sufficient integrity to communicate the reason for its significance.

The historical documentation and description of the property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue are the basis for the following consideration of each of the criteria for designation to the California Register of Historic Resources.

1. The property is not associated with significant events that have contributed to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. The property is part of a large subdivision of land that was originally owned by Southern Pacific Rail Road Company and transferred to a new entity Pacific Grove Improvement Company when the subdivision of Pacific Grove Acres was recorded in 1919. At that time, the parcel appears to be vacant. In 1926, a house and garage were constructed. The property has been a single-family residence since then. No events of significance are associated with the subject property.

2. The property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue was not found to have a significant association with persons important in local, California or national history. For a period of about five years, it was the home of Alberto Conti, a well-known musician and orchestra conductor. During this time, Maestro Conti traveled extensively conducting for opera companies in the United States and Europe. His career was mostly spent in Los Angles and a second career as an artist was in Carmel. He is not considered to have been an important person in Pacific Grove’s history.
3. The architecture exhibits a vernacular design of a Craftsman (stucco covered) style. The original house was not a fine example of the style and alterations have further eroded the original design. It does not embody distinctive characteristics of the type, period, region or method of construction in an important way. The buildings are not the work of a master and do not possess high artistic values.

4. The excavation and construction of the house, garage, driveway, retaining walls and patios have removed the native soil from most of the property. It is unlikely that the property would yield significant information in history or prehistory.

Conclusion:

The property at 905 Lighthouse Avenue does not meet any of the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.
Name: Martha Dunn  
Email: marthamdunn@comcast.net 
Message: 
Dear Planners, 

I live near 905 Lighthouse, the home (cited below) being considered for a significant remodel.


I am a fairly new resident of this lovely town. A large part of its attraction for me was the abundance of historic homes, as well as the newer homes built in styles compatible to existing architecture and to the surrounding marine and woody environments. The design proposed for 905 Lighthouse stands in jarring contrast to the neighborhood. Its very sleek and 'techie' style would be appropriate in a more modern setting, but that setting is not here. Simply put, it is a misfit.

Please consider the heritage of this wonderful place and support building that enhances that heritage rather than detracts from it.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Martha (Marty) Dunn 
219 Bentley Street 
PG 
marthamdunn@comcast.net 

Attached File: 

Submitted on Saturday, December 29, 2018 - 4:04 pm
January 8, 2019, Item 7B, Application #: Architectural Permit (AP) / Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) 18-0957 (Form submission from: Contact the Architectural Review Board)

1 message

Anthony Ciani via City of Pacific Grove Website <website@cityofpacificgrove.org>                    Mon, Jan 7, 2019 at 3:47 PM
Reply-To: Anthony Ciani <aciani@cianiarchitecture.com>
To: ahunter@cityofpacificgrove.org

Name: Anthony Ciani
Email: aciani@cianiarchitecture.com

Message:

Dear Chair Boyle and Members of the ARB:

The existing structure and property is the subject of Phase I Historical Assessment entitled "Historic Resource Evaluation" submitted 12 December 2018 and Revised 2 January 2019. Therefore, I believe that report and property must be reviewed by the Historic Resource Committee to make a finding regarding the historical qualifications and appropriate review process.

Please forward this matter to the HRC for its decision.

Thank you,

Tony Ciani, Architect
Historic Preservation Consultant
CHRIS

Attached File:

Submitted on Monday, January 7, 2019 - 3:47 pm
905 Lighthouse Ave (Form submission from: Contact the Architectural Review Board)

Robin Aeschliman via City of Pacific Grove Website <website@cityofpacificgrove.org>  
Reply-To: Robin Aeschliman <robinaeschliman@aol.com>  
Tue, Jan 8, 2019 at 2:34 PM

Name: Robin Aeschliman  
Email: robinaeschliman@aol.com

Message:  
Chair Boyle and Members of the Architectural Review Board:  

Forgive me, please. I fully intended to speak at today’s ARB meeting—a family situation has changed my plans.

I would like to encourage members of the ARB to consider having the architect provide a rendering that shows the proposed design in its true context. The rendering shown on the plan is misleading—there is not an abundance of land or sky surrounding the proposed home—rather it is tightly embraced by surrounding structures.

I’d also like to ask the ARB to consider the proposed design in the context of the defining architecture of the historic vibe of Pacific Grove and the proposed design’s relationship to it.

I’m concerned about precedent, as well. Approval of a design so at odds with the raison d’etre of the community in which it’s placed may have far reaching consequence for which the community is unprepared. I am reminded of the gentrified bungalow neighborhoods of Los Angeles area and our neighbor, Carmel-by-the-Sea irreversibly changed by the placement of an imposing boxy structure within neighborhoods of homes of more modest and traditional design.

Thank you,  
Robin Aeschliman  
220 Bentley Street  
Pacific Grove

Attached File:

Submitted on Tuesday, January 8, 2019 - 2:34 pm
Dear Board Members,

We have been frequent visitors to Pacific Grove for 30yrs, and just this past September managed to purchase a home on Alder St. We are new to the neighborhood, but have already met many of our neighbors whom we have found to be friendly and welcoming. It was over the Christmas holiday that we first heard of the proposed development of 905 Lighthouse Ave when we met our neighbor Richard Gallagher for the first time. When we spoke with Dr. Gallagher we learned that he intended to remodel the main home, demolish the existing garage and build a new garage back towards the rear of the lot so as to minimize the driveway grading for easier entry. We were surprised; however, when we later saw the installed story poles and, after consulting the proposed building plans available from the Pacific Grove Planning Board, found out that the garage move also included an over-garage additional dwelling unit (ADU) - making the rear structure a large two-story building just a few feet from our property line.

The remodel as described in the Permit Application #18-0957 (https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/architectural-review-board/2019/1-8-2019/architectural-review-board-1-8-2019-item-7b-ap-adu-18-0957-905-lighthouse-ave.pdf) represents modern design which includes an automobile workshop at the front primary residence. There is an additional dwelling unit in the rear over a new relocated garage.

The Permit Application took deliberate effort to specifically call out compliance with 5 of the 40 Pacific Grove Design Guidelines (https://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/sites/default/files/general-documents/design-guidelines-and-handouts/architectural-review-guidelines_rev-1-18-18.pdf) #4, #7, #13, #15 and #21 - detailing the garage view from the street, balcony design to minimize the loss of privacy, taking advantage of the natural slope of land, landscaping, and minimizing impact to existing trees. These are all important considerations, and have apparently all been in some ways accommodated. Other Design Guidelines; however, warrant further consideration by this Board. These include, but are not limited to, guidelines #1, #5, #6, #9, and #22 - describing the mass and height of new buildings, the privacy between properties, the obstruction of sunlight, the preservation of some portion of neighbor’s view, and the protection of root systems of significant trees.

My following comments will focus not on the primary residence, or on whether the overall design fits in with the existing architecture in Pacific Grove, others are more suited to judge that, but rather on the over-garage ADU in rear in as much as the design guidelines are concerned:

#1 - The large size of the proposed two-story structure towers over the rear and side property lines of neighboring properties at 204 and 208 Alder St respectively, and will dominate the appearance from those neighbor’s perspectives.

#5 - Natural light, is an important benefit for any home. In some homes, particularly ones with windows only on one side of the primary living area, that importance is more keenly perceived. The two-story structure will limit natural light filtration into our dining and living rooms - the entire day- to-day living area of our home, which relies on three north-facing windows for much of that light. (please see photos below of the story poles from those windows)

#6 - Privacy into adjacent primary living area is an important consideration for neighbors. Two windows of the proposed ADU will be able to look directly down and into our primary living area - the planned windows being <20ft away from our living room and dining room windows.

#9 - A principal attraction for this home location, and for Pacific Grove in general, is the proximity to, and views of, the beautiful Monterey Bay. The proposed two-story structure will completely obliterate...
all views of the bay from three windows in our primary living area - not obstruct, rather completely eliminate. Instead we will see the tall façade of the back of a garage and ADU. Were the proposed over-garage ADU plans to go forward it would be tantamount to creating a view from an ADU remodel add-on at the expense of a neighbor’s primary view.

#22 - The removal of extensive soil for the grading and concrete pad necessary for a two-story building may detrimentally affect the root system of the very large and beautiful multi-trunk Coast Live Oak tree in the southeast corner of the property. It is my understanding that the project will have the oversight of an arborist, an important and necessary precaution. The magnificence of this wonderful tree cannot be overstated. Anything and everything in the power of the Town ordinances must be done to protect this wonderful native specimen.

From the development plans submitted by Marvin Bamburg Associates there appears to be some possible flexibility in the design that would make it relatively easy to reconfigure the rear portion to accommodate compliance with the five Pacific Grove Design Guidelines noted here. It is our hope that there might be a way to reduce the height of the ADU, ideally making it a one-story ADU with an adjacent carport in front or to the side, which could require less excavating; and/or moving it forward on the property, providing a small “backyard area” for the ADU residents, more space between neighbors to avoid some of the issues noted above, and more undisturbed topsoil to better protect and preserve the root system of the Live Oak tree.

My wife Karen and I are new to Pacific Grove. We wish to have a harmonious relationship with all our neighbors and with the town, but feel that we must speak up about the proposed changes relating to this remodel, particularly in as much as its rear ADU-over-garage structure would significantly impact the livability quality of our new home and jeopardize the aforementioned tree. A beneficial attribute of the town governance in Pacific Grove is the well-organized process to make comments in such matters. For this opportunity we are grateful. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

James & Karen Bustillo
james@bustillo.org
c: (510) 774-1235

ps. The six images below are included for reference.
Image 1:
Story poles of over-garage-ADU as seen from driveway of 208 Alder St - an abrupt and massive presence
Image 2: from dining room window - light and views will be blocked/eliminated
Image3: from living room window - light and views will be blocked/eliminated
Image 4: proximity to tree
- over-garage ADU foundation on tree root system, roofline encroaching on major limbs
Image 5: the magnificent Coast Live Oak, now crowded by the over-garage ADU
Image 6: the rear over-garage ADU
- top right drawing showing location of windows which will face directly into neighbor's living area