

Exhibit B

This page intentionally left blank.

Discussion

DISCUSSION:

Proposed Project

The project consists of the demolition of an existing two story 2,254 square foot single family dwelling with an attached garage and the construction of a 3,671 square foot home with a 3,560 square foot basement including a below grade garage.

The subject property is in an established neighborhood east of the Monterey Peninsula Country Club Shore Golf Course. Lots in the neighborhood are fairly uniform in size (approximately 10,000 sq. ft.), shape (rectangular) and width (approximately 90 ft.) The subject property is consistent with this; it is rectangular in shape and slightly over 10,000 square feet in area. The blocks in this area are tiered sloping down toward the coast. The subject lot is at approximately the same elevation as the lots to the north and south. The lots to the east (to the rear) are approximately six feet higher in elevation.

The existing house has a Cape Code Revival style of architecture with a steeply pitched roof and two dormers facing the street. The foot print is compact with a 24 front yard setback and 58.4 foot rear yard setback.

The proposed home has a Spanish Colonial architectural influence, including an interior courtyard. Site planning has moved the structure up to the 20 foot front yard setback and back to an 11.9 foot rear yard setback for a single story element with the second story of the proposed house is being approximately 28 feet from the rear property line. Materials and colors consist of beige exterior stucco walls, clay tile roof, brown wood trim and bronze gates. The height of the building would be 27 feet above grade. The design also includes a series of decks located either at the level of the second story or above the second story.

Access to the below grade garage would be by a driveway along the southern (side) property line. This sloping driveway results in a 15 foot setback along the side with a minimum 20 foot setback for second story elements, the side setback on the other side of the house would be 10 feet for single story elements and 20 feet for two story elements. In addition to a garage, the basement contains a family room, laundry area, office/gym and mechanical room.

Construction of the driveway would require a retaining wall (up to 10 feet tall) along the southern (side) property line. Grading would require 2,281 cubic yards of cut and 4 cubic yards of fill (net 2,577 cubic yards export). Two existing 12-inch ornamental trees would be removed.

The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan showing new plant materials in the front and rear yards. An existing 48-inch Monterey pine in the rear yard and a 10-inch Oak as well as a 12 inch ornamental tree in the front yard would be preserved. A gravel path with a stone border is proposed along the front of the site leading to the northern side yard. A bocce court (50 feet by 10 feet) is proposed along the northern (side) property line.

The applicant has also submitted a lighting plan. Exterior lighting consists of 25 watt wall

mounted scones with a brown rust finish. Landscape lighting includes 25 watt side wall lights with a copper finish and 25 watt pole mounted path lights with a copper finish.

Site Design

The style and design of the house with the interior courtyard, moves the house to the front and rear yard setbacks. Normally neighborhood light, air and open space between houses is provided by a combination of setbacks and Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Setbacks typically provide the envelope in which the building can be placed, but the actual foot print and mass of the building is limited by the FAR. In this case the FAR is being maximized, and the open space normally provided around the house (in the rear or front yards) is placed into an interior court yard which forces the building to the outer edges of the setbacks. Technically the building complies with the setbacks and FAR, but the resulting building footprint appears much larger than a more traditional design. This style of development is typically found on a larger lot, than on a smaller lot with a Medium Density Zoning Designation.

The proposed side yard setbacks (10 feet and 15 feet) provide some separation between structures. The house does not crowd the side property lines.

Architectural Design

The proposed architecture uses a mixture of roof lines, single story and two story elements, and changing lines within the building elevation to provide visual interest. The Spanish Colonial Architectural influence is appropriate for this location. The proposed colors for the house are consistent with the building architecture and are muted and will not detract from the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Character

The purpose of the D District is to "... assure protection of the public viewshed, neighborhood character and to assure the visual integrity of certain developments without imposing undue restrictions on private property." Existing development within the immediate vicinity of the subject site includes a mix of homes varying in size, age and architectural styles. There is about a 50-50 mix of one and two story homes nearby (i.e., of the 13 closest houses, six are single story and seven are two stories). It is a neighborhood in transition with the newer homes essentially building to the minimum setbacks and maximum coverage and the older homes with greater setbacks, less coverage and more open space. The newer homes tend to be larger estate style homes which are a change in the character of the neighborhood. Exhibit I is a comparison of the existing house, proposed project and two nearby houses that are currently under construction at 1033 Marcheta Lane (PLN140209), and 1034 Marcheta Lane (PLN130612).

The new home across the street at 1033 Marcheta Lane has similar size, FAR, coverage and setbacks as the proposed project. It was designed by the same architect and has a similar architectural style. In addition, it is also designed with an interior courtyard. However, it is an ocean view home which is adjacent to the Monterey Peninsula Country Club Shore Golf Course so it does not have neighbors to the rear and the neighbors on either side have light, air and open space provided by the adjacent golf course.

As viewed from the street, the proposed house is consistent with the neighborhood character, particularly the two newer homes across the street and the house under construction next door. The front elevation has an articulated roofline, recessed entry and balconies which break up the mass of the structure. The proposed colors and materials are similar to the existing materials and colors and are consistent with those in the neighborhood, particularly the house under construction across the street (1033 Marcheta Lane).

However, as viewed from the back yards of neighboring properties, the proposed project is not in keeping with the neighborhood character. The proposed exterior courtyard patio becomes private open space and pushes the house closer to the property lines, particularly to the rear. The older homes adjacent to the site have more open space in the rear yards. In addition, the home under construction next door (1034 Marcheta Lane) has a greater rear yard setback (46.9 ft. first and second floors) compared to the proposed project (11 ft. first floor and 28 feet second floor). The design of the adjacent home is more in keeping with other nearby properties which have more open space in the rear yard compared to the proposed project.

Tree Protection

The driveway requires excavation to provide access to the below grade garage. The grading is proposed within the root zones of three Monterey Cypress trees on the neighboring property at 1028 Marcheta Lane. The neighbor at 1028 Marcheta Lane submitted an arborist's report dated January 27, 2016 prepared by Frank Ono (see **Exhibit F**) which addresses proposed grading adjacent to three Monterey cypress trees. The report recommends that roots of the Monterey cypress trees on the adjacent property not be severed closer than a distance four times the trunk diameter. If the project is approved, a redesign of this area will be necessary in order to preserve these trees on the neighboring property. This would require relocating the retaining wall for the proposed driveway further from the southern property line of the subject site.

Archeology

The parcel is located within a high sensitivity area for archaeological resources. An Archaeological Assessment (LIB160140) dated April 29, 2016 was prepared by Archaeological Consulting. That report did not include subsurface testing. A subsurface testing report dated June 8, 2016 was subsequently prepared. No cultural materials were discovered during the subsurface testing. The reports conclude that the project should not be delayed for archaeological reasons. If the project is approved, a condition of approval should identify steps to be taken if archaeological resources are unexpectedly discovered during construction.

Issues Raised by Neighbors

Staff conducted two site visits and met with the neighbors on both occasions. The neighbors expressed concerns that due to the size and bulk of the proposed structure, it is not in keeping with the neighborhood character. Three neighbors submitted a letter (see Exhibit E) stating:

“The proposed project is massive in scale butting up to all of the property boundary lines and putting what should be backyard space into an interior patio, using covered patios and walkways with roof lines and designing atrium like rooms which are 2 stories tall and labeled ‘open to below’ on the plans.”

In addition, the neighbor to the south (1028 Marcheta Lane) has also expressed concerns regarding potential impacts of grading on three mature Monterey Cypress trees located on her property.

Pebble Beach Architectural Review Board

The project was reviewed by the Pebble Beach Architectural Review Board (ARB). In response to comments from the ARB, the architect removed a covered patio on the second story at the rear of the structure. The ARB approved the revised plans.

LUAC Recommendation

On August 4, 2016 the Del Monte Forest Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) reviewed the proposed project. The committee reviewed the revised plans that were approved by the Pebble Beach ARB, which are the same as the current plans. Several neighbors attended the meeting and expressed concerns regarding the project. The committee voted 5-1-1-1 to recommend denial of the project (see Exhibit D, LUAC minutes). The LUAC minutes state:

“The County rules for lot coverage leave a loophole for the interior unroofed area and patio area under a roof structure which is as massive as the house roof to go uncounted. Yet the apparent coverage and massing from neighboring lots is enormous, way out of proportion for the neighborhood. For this reason, the LUAC recommends the project be denied as submitted.”

Conclusion

The analysis above has raised the issue of whether it is consistent with the intent and purpose of the FAR requirement to have an interior court yard in this neighborhood setting. The interior court yard pushes the development to the perimeter of the site, at the expense of maintaining light, air and open space around the structure. The site technically complies with the zoning requirements, but this is a different development concept than envisioned by the zoning for medium density residential lots. This change in the development pattern raises the question of whether this is consistent with neighborhood character. On smaller lots where the area around the building is important for providing separation between buildings, the use of an interior courtyard takes away from the space between structures. This design is out of place in this context.

For these reasons, staff recommends that the public hearing be continued and the applicant be directed to redesign the project as follows:

- Eliminate the interior courtyard patio.
- Increase the rear setback thereby providing more open space in the rear yard which is more in keeping with the neighborhood.
- Redesign the retaining wall along the south property line to avoid the critical root zones of trees on the neighboring property.

Alternatively if the Zoning Administrator decides to deny the application, or if the applicant does not agree to make these changes, a resolution of denial has been prepared (see Exhibit C).