MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
PLANNING COMMISSION

6:00 p.m., Thursday, October 8, 2015

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; 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/pc. Recordings of the meetings are available upon request. Materials can also be requested of staff during the PC hearing.

1. **Call to Order - 6:01 p.m.**

2. **Roll Call**
   Commissioners Present: Robin Aeschliman, Mark Chakwin (Secretary), Bill Fredrickson (Chair), Donald Murphy, Nicholas Smith

   Commissioners Absent: Jeanne Byrne

3. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. September 17th, 2015

      On a motion by Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Bluhm, the Commission voted 6-0-1 (Byrne absent) to approve the minutes with correction to note only Commissioner Chakwin was absent. Motion carried.

4. **Public Comments**
   a. Written Communications
      None.

   b. Oral Communications
      None.

5. **Presentations**
   a. None.

6. **Items to be Continued**
   a. None.

7. **Consent Agenda**
   a. **Acceptance of Minutes from Other Bodies**
      None

DRAFT

8. Regular Agenda

a. Address: 415 7th Street Pacific Grove, CA- continued from September 3, 2015
Permit Application: Use Permit No. 15-413
Project Description: To permit an existing 316 sf detached garage with an existing guest bedroom and bathroom**.**
Owner: Melanie Meharchand
Zone District: R-1
General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential, 17.4 DU/ac
Assessor's Parcel Number: 006-504-008
CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption, Class 15301
Staff Reference: Mark Brodeur, CEDD Director
Recommendation: Deny subject to Staff findings

Laurel O'Halloran, Associate Planner, presented a staff report.

The Commission opened the floor for public comments. Ms. Pamela Silkwood of Horan Legal, representative of the applicant, supported approving the use permit. Mr. Salven Pillay and Ms. Melanie Meharchand, the property owners, spoke and supported approving the use permit. Ms. Lisa Milligan, a resident, spoke and supported approving the use permit. Ms. Joy Coangelo, a neighbor, spoke and requested to not require off-street parking for the approval of the permit. Mr. Anthony Teresol, a resident, spoke and requested to not require off-street parking for the approval of the permit. The Commission closed the floor for public comments.

The Commission also acknowledged a written document regarding the former use of the accessory structure, and another written document not supporting approval of the use permit.

Mr. Alex Lorca, the Deputy City Attorney, stated that the Building Permit 97-0376 condition from 1997 denies allowing a dwelling unit, but the Commission may vote to eliminate or waive the condition.

The Commission discussed the project.

On a motion by Commissioner Chakwin, seconded by Chairman Fredrickson, and amended by Commissioner Murphy, the Commissioner voted 5-1-0 (Commissioner Smith opposed and Commissioner Byrne absent) to approve the use permit and eliminate the Building Permit condition from 1997; and with a deed restriction to be recorded with the County of Monterey that the accessory structure will not be used as a second unit. The motion carried.

b. Address: 631 Ocean View Blvd, Pacific Grove, 93950
APN: 006-084-002
Permit Application: Use Permit (UP) and Architectural Permit (AP) 14-441 Landscape

Plan
Description: Landscape plan
Applicant/Owner: James D. McCord AIA Architect/Ostrich Inc c/o Chris Hyland
Zoning/Land Use: C-D/Commercial
CEQA: Class 1 Categorical Exemption
Staff Reference: Laurel O'Halloran, Associate Planner
Recommended Action: Final Approval

Ms. Laurel O'Halloran, Associate Planner, presented a staff report.

CEDD Director Mark Brodeur stated that the applicant must plant one tree every 30 feet, or pay an in-lieu-of fee.

The Commission opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Jim McCord, applicant, spoke in opposition of Condition #1 to remove trees and fund the removal of trees; and also spoke in opposition of Condition #2 to remove the trash enclosures.

Mr. Scott Hall, a landscape architect and on behalf of applicant, presented the updated landscape plan.

Mr. Ken Turgen, representing the Lover's Point Inn, expressed concern with the proposed location of the Cypress Tree, and the current trash compactor's operation and noise.

Mr. Dave Sawyer, representing the Borg's Hotel, requested additional time to review the plans and also expressed concern with the trash compactor. Mr. Sawyer also referenced December 14th, 2014 meeting transcript and requested the provision that the hedge to be trimmed at 4 feet above grade.

Mr. Paul Dreck, owner of Borg's Motel, spoke and cited approved plans according to Dec. 14th, 2014 meeting. Mr. Dreck opposed new location of trees.

Mr. Cosmo Bua, resident, spoke of the coastal zone's intent to protect public views, not private views, and voiced support for the requirement of one tree every 30 feet.

Mr. Michael Lam, attorney representing Lover's Point Inn, expressed concern about the inadequate time provided to review the landscape plans.

Ms. Lynn Mason, resident, spoke in support of City's tree canopy goals and support of Monterey Cypress, and opposition to removal of trees.

Mr. Jim McCord spoke in support of keeping the trash enclosure and removing the compactor. He noted that the trash compactor is not in the scope of work.

The Commission closed the floor for public comments.

The Commission discussed the project.

Commissioner Aeschliman stated that the subcommittee has met, but did not yet come to a consensus regarding the plant choices.

Mr. Alex Lorca, the Deputy City Attorney, stated that the Planning Commission has the discretion to interpret the tree ordinance.

On a motion by Chairman Fredrickson, seconded by Commissioner Chakwin, the Commission voted 6-0-1 (Commissioner Byrne absent) to have the subcommittee continue its work and then provide the Commission with a recommendation by the November 5th, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried.

Commissioner Bluhm will coordinate the subcommittee meeting(s), and the subcommittee will meet without staff.

9. Call-up of ARB's decision

a. Address: 14 Acropolis Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Architecture Permit No. 15-399
Project Description:
Applicant/Owner: Eric Miller Architects/Richard & Gerrilyn Iest
Zone District/ General Plan: R-1-H/MDR 17.9 DU/AC
General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential, 17.4 DU/ac
Assessor's Parcel Number: 006-011-013
CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption, Class 15331
Staff Reference: Laurel O'Halloran, Associate Planner
Recommendation: Deny the appeal and approve

Ms. Laurel O'Halloran, Associate Planner, presented a staff report.

The Commission opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Eric Miller of Eric Miller Architects presented the project.

The Commission closed the floor for public comments.

The Commission discussed the project.

In response to the Chairman's comment about a possible variance to Pacific Grove Municipal Code, the applicant agreed to correct the planned height of the building on the east elevation to 25 feet instead of 26 feet.

DRAFT

Commissioner Murphy expressed concerns with the size of the structure and neighborhood compatibility.

Commissioner Smith commended the architecture of the structure and protection of neighbors' views.

Commissioner Chakwin commended the architecture of the structure and its complementariness to the environment.

Commissioner Aeschliman noted the mass of the structure, and stated a preference for a variation in the roof.

Chairman Fredrickson stated the evolution of the neighborhood shows a trend toward remodels into two-story homes. Chairman Fredrickson also requested that the lot merger and plans approval process to be standardized in the future.

Commissioner Bluhm stated that the structure will be large in size, and commended the architectural design. Commissioner Bluhm also stated that Commissioner Byrne favored the project, with the exception of the building height concern which will be addressed by the architect.

On a motion by Commissioner Bluhm, seconded by Commissioner Chakwin, the Commission voted 6-0-1 (Commissioner Byrne absent) to deny the appeal, on the condition that the structure's height limit will be corrected. The motion carried.

10. Reports of PC Subcommittees

a. Commissioner Smith updated the Commission about the status of the Building Standards Subcommittee. The Subcommittee has made progress reviewing the issues including lot-merger reviews, off-street parking and zoning code considerations. They are still working these issues and will present updates in future reports.

11. Reports of PC Commissioners

a. Commissioner Murphy stated that the Coastal Commission approved the Deli in Beach House, and that the Deli should open by the end of the year.

12. Reports of Council Liaison

a. City Councilman Rudy Fischer presented to the Commission on the recent updates from the City Council.

13. Director's Report

a. Local Coastal Program Workshops: October 19 & November 20

b. October 27, 2015 Joint Planning Commission with City of Monterey – Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Guidance Document
CEDD Director Mark Brodeur presented to the Commission and noted that PG Planning Commissioners are invited to participate in the Joint Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioners Aeschliman and Chakwin stated interest in attending the meeting. Chairman Fredrickson requested information about yearly measurement of sea level rise for Pacific Grove, which Director Brodeur noted may be available from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), based on requirements proffered by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

14. Adjournment at 9:21pm.

15. Next meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 22, 2015 at 6pm at Council Chambers.

DRAFT

Item 6A
Item 3.b

Dear Planning Commission,

Our family would urge you to consider the following: Numerous homes in our neighborhood strongly oppose "is hort-term rentals." The turnover is tremendous and we never know who is living in our neighborhood. We are concerned with our safety and the safety of the several young families in the surrounding areas. In addition we strongly believe that this will erode the community feel that we long for.

Please do not legalize the carriage (415) 7th house as it will be used as an additional rental,

RECEIVED

OCT 08 2015

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
COMMUNITY DEV DEPT

this will cause a negative impact on parking and congestion in what should be a small town feel.

furthermore, we feel open to free enterprise, in its proper place. help us to preserve the hometown feel of this well established neighborhood.

Sincerely, anonymous

RECEIVED
OCT 08 2015
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
COMMUNITY DEV DEPT

To: Pacific Grove Planning Commission

From: Tom Biggs & Henrietta Stern
412 7th St., Pacific Grove

Date: October 8, 2015

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
2015 OCT -8 I A 9:52
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

Subject: Comment on Item Regarding property at 415 7th St.

This letter is to comment on a planning commission item regarding legalizing an existing 316 ft detached garage with an existing guest bedroom and bathroom. Having lived across the street from this property for over 25 years, we question whether this is a garage. We have seen this property sold a number of times and advertised as a carriage house. The concrete and curb directly in front of structure has not had a cutout for a driveway and thus we consider it to not be a garage.

That being said, we are not opposed to legalizing the guest bedroom and bathroom in this existing structure. In the past, there was a kitchen added and the structure rented out illegally. This was removed and returned to the one bedroom and one bathroom configuration that currently exists. As a condition for legalizing the bedroom and bathroom with its current water credits, we would request a site visit from the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District to verify that the current water fixtures match those which were previously tabulated.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Tom Biggs

Henrietta Stern

HORAN | LLOYD

ANTHONY T. KARACHALE
STEPHEN W. DYER
MARK A. BLUM
JAMES J. COOK
ELIZABETH C. GIANOLA
JEROME F. POLITZER
PAMELA H. SILKWOOD
JACQUELINE M. PIERCE
BIANCA KARIM
JENNIFER M. PAVLET
GREGORY J. CARPER

Of Counsel
FRANCIS P. LLOYD
ROBERT ARNOLD INC.

LAURENCE P. HORAN
(1929-2012)

HORAN LLOYD
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
26385 Carmel Rancho Blvd., #200
Carmel, CA 93923

Pamela H. Silkwood

psilkwood@horanlegal.com

File No.

Tel: 831.373.4131
Fax: 831.373.8302
horanlegal.com

October 2, 2015

Via Electronic Mail and Hand Delivery
City of Pacific Grove
Attn: Planning Commission
City Hall
300 Forest Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

RE: 415 7th St., Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Honorable Commissioners:

This firm represents Melanie Meharchand and Salven Pillay ("Client") regarding the above referenced property ("Property"). This letter is to request that the Commission determine the detached residential structure constructed in 1970 to be an allowable legal nonconforming use, whereby no use permit is required, for the following reasons:

- Prior to my Client's purchase of the Property, the City staff affirmed that the Property was in full compliance with the City Code through the City's Residential Zoning Records Report and in phone conferences with City planners. Immediately upon my Client's purchase of the Property, the City issued a notice of non-compliance for the detached residential structure on the Property.
- Even though the Assessor's Building Records clearly show that the detached residential structure, with a kitchen and a bathroom, was constructed in 1970, the City applied a current code provision that was enacted in 1976 to issue a code violation. The City can only apply the code provisions that were applicable at the time the structure was constructed. Acting otherwise is unconstitutional.
- The structure is a legal, nonconforming use and continuance of that use is allowed under the vested right doctrine and under specific City Code provisions.
- The City cannot discriminate against the Property by requiring additional requirements for uses allowable for residential properties under the City Code, such as transient rental, simply because the Property is a legal, nonconforming use. Such action would be arbitrary and discriminatory.

The above is further detailed in the body of this letter.

As background, my Client purchased the Property on July 2, 2015. Prior to the purchase, they performed a thorough due diligence of the Property, including phone conferences with City Planning staff to ensure that the Property was in full compliance with the City Code. They also obtained the Residential Zoning Records Report for the Property from the City, upon a payment of $151 in fee. The Residential Zoning Records Report identified the two structures on the property as a single-family residence and provided the following:

> Interior inspection conducted on 10-22-14; No violations noted.
>
> Reinspected – 6/11/15 STILL OK NO VIOLATIONS NOTED

The Residential Zoning Records Report is included as Exhibit "A".

In addition to the two City inspections above, the City had previously thoroughly reviewed compliance of the Property through a code violation that was issued against the Property in 1997. The City issued a code violation against the very same detached structure and required a removal of the kitchen to remedy the violation, which occurred in 1998. The City's Notice of Code Compliance, dated February 3, 1998 (included as Exhibit "B"), states in relevant part the following:

> Your prompt cooperation in correcting this violation and bringing your property into compliance with the City Code is greatly appreciated.

In reliance of the Residential Zoning Records Report and other City records and conference calls with the City planners, my Client purchased the Property on July 2, 2015. Shortly upon purchase, my Client received a Notice of Non-Compliance, dated July 14, 2015, from the City. The Notice is based on an erroneous assumption that the bedroom and bathroom had been converted from a garage, although the City staff presented no evidence to support that assumption. Upon pressure from the City Planning staff to remedy the violation, my Client submitted an application for a use permit for the detached residential structure, which is the application before you.

The Property is listed as a historic resource on the City's historic resources inventory. The City staff report, dated September 3, 2015, acknowledges that the one-story residence of 471 square feet was constructed in 1916, and the 316 square feet detached residential structure of 316 square feet was constructed in 1970. The report also acknowledges that adequate water credits are available to support the fixtures in the two structures.

However, because the planning records do not include City approval of the bathroom in the detached structure constructed in 1970, the City staff elected to apply the current Code, in particular section 23.16.021 *Use Permit*, to issue a code violation. Section 23.16.021, which requires a Use Permit for a detached structure with plumbing, was not enacted until 1976, through Ordinance 885; thus, it does not and must not apply to the detached structure constructed in 1970.

It is unconstitutional to retroactively apply the current code to a structure that was constructed over 40 years ago unless that specific code provision(s) was in effect at that time. The City can only apply the code provisions that were applicable at the time the structure was constructed. The property owner has acquired a vested right to continue the existing use and to maintain the structure, contrary to the newer zoning restriction.

Evidence of the bathroom (and kitchen) in the detached structure is provided in the Assessor's Building Records, which is included as Exhibit "C." The detached structure is identified as "residential" (and not as a garage), with a bathroom and a kitchen, constructed on August 14, 1970. Due to the lack of any evidence that the detached structure was constructed inconsistent with the City Code in effect at the time of construction in 1970, the structure must be considered a legal nonconforming use. (*City of Los Angeles v Gage* (1954) 127 CA2d 442, 453. See also *Hansen Bros. Enters., Inc. v Board of Supervisors* (1996) 12 C4th 533, 552; *County of Sonoma v Rex* (1991) 231 CA3d 1289, 1297 (differentiating between lawful nonconforming use and illegal nonconforming use).)

The City Code recognizes legal nonconforming structures and uses. (City Code §23.68.010.) Section 23.68.020 states,

> If the use of land, including buildings, structures, or other improvements thereon was lawful before the ordinances codified in this title were passed or amended, the use may be continued, although such use does not conform to the regulations for the district in which such land is located. (Section 23.68.020.) Nonconforming use cannot be enlarged or increased, nor extended to occupy a greater area than was occupied by such use on the date of passage of an ordinance making such use nonconforming.

Accordingly, the legal, nonconforming use of the Property is allowed to continue, and the Property must be afforded full benefits of all allowable uses for residential properties, including use as transient rental. Transient rental is as an allowable use for residential properties under Section 7.40.020 of the City Code as follows:

> Transient use of residential property for remuneration is allowed pursuant to Chapter 23.64 PGMC or this chapter.

The Property falls within the following definition of "residential property" for which transient rental is allowed:

> Residential property means any dwelling unit, except those dwelling units lawfully established as second units established pursuant to Chapter 23.80 PGMC or as part of a bed and breakfast inn, motel, hotel, timeshare development, or other transient use. (City Code §23.08.020.)

Nowhere in the Code is transient rental considered enlargement or an increase of nonconforming use that is prohibited under section 23.68.020. Nor is transient rental described in the City Code as intensification or a change in the residential use. The Property must be allowed the same uses as any other residential property within the City boundary -- acting otherwise would be arbitrary and discriminatory.

Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that you determine the Property to be a legal, nonconforming use and direct your staff to (1) refund my Client for the fee already paid for the Use Permit application and (2) process the transient use license application.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela H. Silkwood

Cc: Mark Brodeur
Terri C. Schaeffer
Laurel O' Holloran

Exhibit A

DocuSign Envelope ID: 4A186C01-C143-4275-B82F-D4C17C8D7CA3

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
RESIDENTIAL ZONING RECORDS REPORT

DATE: 05-30-2014
ADDRESS: 415 7TH ST PG
PARCEL #: 006504008000
OWNER: RICE MARY E & FRACK JANICE RAE

RZRR #: GZ14-0090
SEND REPORT: joywelch@redshift.com
PHONE #: NOT GIVEN

RZRR FEE: $151.00 RECEIPT #: RECEIVED BY: DT

Zone: R-1 Use or Occupancy: Single Family Residence
Special Permits/Restrictions:
No Archaeologically Sensitive Area
No Coastal Zone
YES Drainage into ASBS Watershed
YES Historic Resources Inventory* (HRI)
*If building is greater than or equal to 50 years of age and not on HRI, an Initial Historic Screening or Phase 1 Historic Assessment may be required prior to exterior alterations to the building. See a planner for more information.
Very High Fire Hazard Zone: No
Signature of Inspector: [signature] Date: 6-3-14

I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I HAVE RECEIVED AND READ A COPY OF THIS REPORT:

Signature of Buyer/Agent: [signature] Date: 6/18/2015

AFTER SIGNATURE OF
AGENT/BUYER RETURN REPORT TO: CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE BUILDING DEPARTMENT
300 FOREST AVENUE
PACIFIC GROVE, CA 93950

VIOLATIONS REQUIRING PERMIT FOR IMMEDIATE CORRECTION:

It appears there are two units. schedule an interior inspection of all areas

Interior inspection conducted 10-22-14; No violations noted.

REINSPECTED - 6/11/15 STILL OK NO VIOLATIONS NOTED [signature]

A thirty (30) day period is given to make the necessary corrections. A reinspection will then be made to ensure compliance.

No Written verification needed of lateral by a licensed plumber (See attached)
No Sewer lateral needs replacement _____ Sewer line replaced Permit #_____

Pacific Grove City Municipal Code Section 9.20.030 requires that, if necessary, a building be protected from sewage backflow by installation of an approved device. Compliance with this ordinance is the responsibility of the property owners. Owners will be responsible for any damage resulting from any sewer backup if this device is not installed and working properly.

FOR REINSPECTION ONLY (if applicable):
SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR: _____ DATE: _____

This report does not cover maintenance, obsolescence or other conditions but only report visible violations of City regulations or obvious safety hazards detected on EXTERIOR inspection. Prior inspection errors or omissions shall not prevent the City from abating any noted violations on the property against the seller, buyer or any subsequent owner.

Exhibit B

CITY COUNCIL
SANDRA L. (SANDY) KOFFMAN
MAYOR
ROBERT E. (BOB) DAVIS
STEVE HONEGGER
ROBERT HUITT
JAMES W. (JIM) COSTELLO
MORRIS G. FISHER
CHRISTIE MARTINE

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

300 FOREST AVENUE
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950
TELEPHONE (408) 648-3100
FAX (408) 375-9863

MICHAEL W. HUSE
CITY MANAGER
PETER WOODRUFF
ADMIN. SERVICES DIRECTOR
CITY CLERK AND TREASURER
GEORGE C. THACHER
CITY ATTORNEY

February 3, 1998

Robert and Katherine Gudgel
P.O. Box 476
Chowchilla, CA 93610

RE: NOTICE OF CODE COMPLIANCE
415 7th STREET

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Gudgel:

The Building Inspector confirms that the kitchen plumbing and fixtures were removed from 415 7th Street as of the January 6, 1998, inspection. I apologize for any confusion regarding this compliance.

Your prompt cooperation in correcting this violation and bringing your property into compliance with the City Code is greatly appreciated.

Please feel free to call me (646-0258) if I can be of assistance to you in the future regarding code compliance in Pacific Grove. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Stephanie A. Atigh

STEPHANIE A. ATIGH
CODE COMPLIANCE OFFICER

Recycled Paper

Exhibit C

Item 3.b

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING RECORD

ADDRESS 415 - 7TH ST. PARCEL 6 - 550 - 4 - 8

SHEET 2 OF 2 SHEET

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

CLASS & SHAPE	CONSTRUCTION	STRUCTURAL	EXTERIOR	ROOF	LIGHTING	AIR CONDITION
D 2 D	Light	Frame	Stucco on	Flat / Hip	WIRING	Central
ARCHITECTURE	x Sub Stand	x Single Wall	Sheathing	Gable x Shed	K.T. / Conc.	M-BTU
CONV	Standard	Sheathing	Siding	4 Pitch	B.X. / B.X.	Floor Unit
1 Stories	Above Stand	Conc. Block	Alum. Siding	Ft Overhang	FIXTURES	x Zone Unit
USE TYPE	Special	Brick	Asb. Shingle	Sealed	Few / Cheap	Wall Unit
x Single	FOUNDATION	Adobe / Post	Wood Shingle	No Ridges	Avg. / Med.	Radiant
Double	x Concrete	Floor Joist	Shakes	Tar & Gravel	Many / Spec.	Baseboard
Duplex	Reinforced	Beam & Girder	x D & B / T & G	Gutters		Gravity
Apartment	Brick	Conc. Slab	Stone	Dormers	PLUMBING	Heat Pump
Guest House	Wood	Sub. Floor	Brick	Shingle	Poor / Good	
Court	Piers		WINDOWS	Shake		Oil Burner
Motel			x D.H. x C'Ment	Tile	Fixtures	Fireplace
	Medium		Alum. Sash		Water Heater	
Units	x Light / Heavy	Ins. Ceilings	Steel Sash	x Composition	Softener	Fireplace
		Ins. Walls	Screens	Comp. Shingle	Gas / Elect.	

ROOM AND FINISH DETAIL									
Rooms	Floors B	1	2	Floor Finish Material	Grade	Trim	Interior Finish Walls	Ceiling
Ent. Hall								
Living								
Family								
Den								
Dining								
Bed 2								
Bed								
Utility								
Kitchen	x REMODELED 1997							
Drain Bd	Material			Lath		Ft Splash		

CONSTRUCTION RECORD				EFFEC YEAR	APPR YEAR	NORMAL % GOOD				RATING (E,G,A,F,P)												BATH DETAIL								
Permit No.	For	Amt.	Date			Age	Rem. Life	Table	%	Cond.	Arch. Attr.	Func. Plan	Mat.	Ft. Space	Cbd.	Clos.	Ship	Fl.	No.	Finish Floors	Finish Walls	Fixtures Ctrl	Fixtures Type	Fixtures Grade	Fixtures ST	Fixtures TD	Shower Fini			
					1971																	x	x x							
					1990					P	P	P	P				P	1	1	V TILE										

BUILT-INS & SPEC. FEATURES	
Range & Oven	Refrigerator
Hood & Fan	Book cases
Ceiling Fan	Inter-Com
Dishwasher	Disposal

Appraiser & Date		Per Prop. III 8-14-70		Per Prop. 0 Ap 6-2-76		Per Prop. W & S 77 2-20-84		Per Prop. 97 12-5-98		Per Prop.		Per Prop.		Per Prop.		Per Prop.	
Unit	Area	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost	Unit Cost	Cost
RPS	316	9.25	3081	14.82	4683												
HEAT			50		250												
NO KITCHEN			-250														
						PALOS ALLOCATION 12.5%		SALES ALLOCATION 8.28									
Total			2881		4933												
Normal % Good			50		70												
R.C.L.N.D.			1440		3453		24500		30000		15						
		Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.	Ck.	Pst.

RECEIVED
SEP 16 2015
BY ASSESSOR

STEPHEN L. VAGNINI
ASSESSOR, MONTEREY COUNTY
P.O. BOX 570
SALINAS, CALIFORNIA 93902

4
5.5
6
8.5
8
20
11
9
37

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING RECORD

PARCEL 006-504-008

MARGARET H. BROWN ADDRESS

SHEET 1 OF 2 SHEETS

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

CLASS & SHAPE	CONSTRUCTION	STRUCTURAL	EXTERIOR	ROOF	LIGHTING	AIR CONDITION
D & 4	Light	Frame	Stucco on	Flat / Hip	WIRING	Central
ARCHITECTURE	x Sub Stand.	x Single Wall		x Gable / Shed	x K.T. / Cond	M-BTU
CONV	Standard	Sheathing	Siding	4 Pitch	R.X. / B.X.	Floor Unit
1 Stories	Above Stand	Conc. Block	Alum. Siding	Ft. Overhang	FIXTURES	Zone Unit
USE TYPE	Special		Asb. Shingle	Sealed	x Few / Cheap	x Wall Unit
x Single	FOUNDATION	Brick	Wood Shingle	No. Ridges	Avg. / Med.	Radiant
Double	Concrete	Adobe / Post	Shakes	Tar & Gravel	Mgh. / Spec.	Baseboard
Duplex	Reinforced	Floor Joist	B&B / T&G	Gutters		Gravity
Apartment	Brick	Beam & Girder	Stone	Dormers	PLUMBING	Heat Pump
Guest House	Wood	Conc. Slab	Brick	Shingle	Room / Good	
Court	Piers	Sub. Floor	WINDOWS	Shake		Oil Burner
Motel	x Sash		D.H. / C. Ment	Tile	Fixtures	Fireplace
	Medium	Ins. Ceilings	Alum. Sash		Water Heater	
Units	Light / Heavy	Ins. Walls	Steel Sash	Composition	Softener	Fireplace
			Screens	x Comp. Shingle	Gas / Elect.	

ROOM AND FINISH DETAIL								
Rooms	Floors B	1	2	Floor Finish Material	Grade	Trim	Interior Finish Walls	Ceiling
Entrance Hall								
Living		x		DRK/TILE			x & S	SP
Family								
Den								
Dining								
Bed		x		x			x	x
Bed								
Utility								
Kitchen		x		LIN				
Drainboard	Material			Lath		Ft. Splash		

CONSTRUCTION RECORD				EFFEC. YEAR	APPR. YEAR	NORMAL Age	NORMAL % GOOD Pers. Life	Table	%	RATING (E, G, A, F, P) Cond.	Arch. & Mech. Attr.	Perf. Appeal	Util. Conf.	Econ. Obsol.
Permit No.	Date	Amt.	Date											
	REAP			1946	1971			DIR	50					
				1946	1976									

BUILT-INS & SPEC. FEATURES	
x Range & Oven	Refrigerator
x Hood & Fan	Book cases
Ceiling Fan	Inter-Com
Dishwasher	Disposal

BATH DETAIL										
Fl. No.	Finish		Fixtures				Shower			
	Floors	Walls	Wndw	Type	Grade	Sh. Dr.	Sp. Finish			
			x	x	x			x	x	

Per Prop.	Per Prop.	Per Prop.	Per Prop. D	Per Prop.	Per Prop.	Per Prop.	Per Prop.	Per Prop.
Appraiser & Date		8-13-76 SP						
Unit / Area	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost	Unit Cost / Cost
PRE #1 DT		1045 / 4780						
SHED								
REC.								
GAR.		15 / 45	74	SALES	SALES			
PAT.		200		700	ALLOCATION	ALLOCATION		
HEAT		136		250	1.15	@ 88		
Total		5155						
Normal % Good		50						
R.C.L.N.D.		2577		25000	25000	20		
	Ck. / Pst.	Ck. / Pst.	Ck. / Pst.	Ck. / Pst.	Ck. / Pst.			

SEP 16 2015

BY ASSESSOR

STEPHEN L. VAGNINI
ASSESSOR, MONTEREY COUNTY
P.O. BOX 570
SALINAS, CALIFORNIA 93902

Item 3.b

SITE CHECK ANCHOR ATTACHMENTS

TYPE	POWER	CODE	QTY	ANCHOR DETAIL	TEST	SIZE ETC

REMARKS: