

**CALL TO ORDER** KH: 6:07 pm

**MEMBER ATTENDANCE** Present: Kevin Hastings (Committee Chair), Chris Chalupsky, Stephanie Villamizar.  
Absent: Chelsea Siefert, Barbara Jankowski

**AGENDA** Approve by consent.

**MINUTES APPROVAL** None.

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT** None.

**ACTION ITEM #1 – 4867-4869 Lotus St (PRJ-1133721)**

Architect: Property was a jungle, 2 story building had 2/1 residence on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, garage on 1<sup>st</sup> floor converted to unit without permit. Other structure was a shack with bathroom converted to residence without permit. New owner remodeled property, added bathroom and kitchen out to property line and someone reported it to city. Zoned for 3 units. Smallest unit on 1<sup>st</sup> floor will be ADU. The 3 others will be standard units. Kitchen/bath will be moved out of setback. 2 story unit has kitchen/bath work to make it ADA compliant, enlarged laundry room and outdoor shower. Front will have landscaping around perimeter with gravel areas. Installing new street trees. No significant cycle comments. 3 parking spaces in back, 4<sup>th</sup> with parallel spot. They asked for bike space, and an accessible space in front on street. Alley is 15ft, other properties are built right up to alley. Parking spaces are accessible, flat, with access to gate. DSD wants 2.5ft off alley, but it would make rear parking not compliant, it is grandfathered, we will contest it. It meets the setbacks. Currently used as long term rentals. Front yard is just open space.

Committee Comments:

SV: Accessible parking will need to be ADA with aisle, etc. City doesn't care about the other properties, will make you give 2.5ft of alley.

CC: ADU vs Junior ADU? Lotus has nice diverse properties, looks denser from google view. Rear setback will have to conform to current code. The trash enclosure at property line would be easy to give up. May have to remove back part of structure to make room for parking.

KH: East side setback looks less than 5ft in photo. City won't budge on alley dedication. Parking requirements conflict. No parking is required except for ADA due to new zero parking TPA. Has to be van accessible, 20ft wide. It is more onerous than previous parking rules. But other structure was never legal, so you don't have an argument if it has to be moved. Curious to see what city decides. If every duplex in OB now requires van accessible parking on site and on street, we'll have zero parking and all the curbs will be blue.

Public Comment: Could still fit accessible spot parallel to alley, would have 15ft width.

**Motion (KH/CC): Recommend applicant present to full board once parking and alley dedication is resolved. Passed 3-0-0.**

***(Note: This is a subcommittee recommendation and shall not be used for city approval.)***

**ACTION ITEM #2 – 4611 Newport Ave (PRJ-1134748)**

Architect: Demolishing 1400sf residence. Keep single car garage and curb cut. (2) 25ft lots, 2 new single family houses each with ADU. Garage and carport in back. Meets 24/30 rule, carport open on 3 sides not included in FAR, 5ft rear setback. Using 800sf ADU rule (to exceed FAR). Historic review requested another photo. We will fight landscape comments, not required for single family.

Public Comments:

Egregious, unnecessary to remove tree in backyard. None of the other houses are this big, it will change the neighborhood.

They removed 100-yr old torrey pine, brought in fill dirt to raise grade, broke sewer and alley. Reckless work, not a positive experience. Will block views. Not in-line with density (size) of other houses in community, would be out of place. Only benefits developer, not neighbors. Arch: Fill dirt to fill tree hole.

I can't find parking because of developers capitalizing, they don't live here. Takes away from community.

*(continued on next page)*

Committee Comments:

SV: Landscaping can be considered in historic review, even with tree removed. Concerned about floor area numbers, impervious areas. Arch: Might consider

CC: Looks like giant stucco walls to anybody uphill, lot natural light. Other shotgun homes on 25ft lots are ugly and against OB community plan, unlivable spaces. The 5 on Newport have high turnover because of design.

KH: A front/back house setup could provide same density, building spacing and match slope of lot, use 50% remodel, would even get more investor value. Missed opportunity, would provide yard space. Carport is not completely open, so not exempt from FAR, will get closed up. On-site parking, won't impact neighbors. 2ft side setback doesn't comply. Front setback encroaches on view corridor, has to be 15/20ft from property line plus 45\* line. Encroaches on side envelope, lines need to be drawn at 3ft. Want to see owners at next meeting. Arch: Disagree on setbacks.

**CC/KH: Recommend non-approval based on lack of adherence to OB community plan, specifically view corridors and building orientation, in addition to needing clarification on cycle comments. Passed 3-0-0.**

***(Note: This is a subcommittee recommendation and shall not be used for city approval.)***

**ACTION ITEM #3 – 1984 Sunset Cliffs Blvd Wireless Facility (PRJ-1125152)**

Designer (Network Connex): No work, reinstating permit that expired in 2023. Photos of existing equipment on church bell tower.

Public Comments: None.

Committee Comments:

KH: Radiation exceeds limits on other properties, what if I build up? App: Mitigation would have to be provided.

**Motion (KH/CC): Recommend supporting project as-is. Passed 3-0-0.**

***(Note: This is a subcommittee recommendation and shall not be used for city approval.)***

**OFFICER'S REPORTS:** None.

**ADJOURN:** 7:47pm