City of Capitola
Planning Commission Meeting Agenda
Thursday, August 17, 2023 – 6:00 PM

City Council Chambers
420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola, CA 95010
Teleconference Location - 611 Campbell Avenue, Los Altos, CA 94024

Chairperson: Susan Westman
Commissioners: Courtney Christiansen, Paul Estey, Gerry Jensen, Peter Wilk

Please review the Notice of Remote Access for instructions on participating in the meeting remotely. The Notice of Remote Access is at the end of the agenda.

All correspondence received prior to 5:00 p.m. on the Wednesday preceding a Planning Commission Meeting will be distributed to Commissioners to review prior to the meeting. Information submitted after 5 p.m. on that Wednesday may not have time to reach Commissioners, nor be read by them prior to consideration of an item.

All matters listed on the Regular Meeting of the Capitola Planning Commission Agenda shall be considered as Public Hearings.

1. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance
   Commissioners Susan Westman, Courtney Christiansen, Paul Estey, Gerry Jensen, Peter Wilk

2. Oral Communications
   A. Additions and Deletions to the Agenda
   B. Public Comments
      Please review the Notice of Remote Access for instructions. This item is for short communications from the public concerning matters not on the Agenda. All speakers are requested to print their name on the sign-in sheet located at the podium so that their name may be accurately recorded in the Minutes. Members of the public may speak for up to three minutes, unless otherwise specified by the Chair. Individuals may not speak more than once during Oral Communications. All speakers must address the entire legislative body and will not be permitted to engage in dialogue.
   C. Commission Comments
   D. Staff Comments

3. Approval of Minutes
   A. July 20, 2023 – Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

4. Consent Calendar
   All matters listed under “Consent Calendar” are considered by the Planning Commission to be routine and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. There will be no separate discussion on these items prior to the time the Planning Commission votes on the action unless members of the public or the Planning Commission request specific items to be discussed for separate review. Items pulled for separate discussion will be considered in the order listed on the Agenda.
A. **1500 Wharf Road #7**  
Permit Number: #23-0228  
APN: 035-194-05  
Historic Alteration Permit first-story modifications to one of the historic Venetian condominium units, located within the MU-V (Mixed Use Village) zoning district.  
This project is in the Coastal Zone and requires a Coastal Development Permit which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission after all possible appeals are exhausted through the City.  
Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption  
Property Owner: Viola Carr and Sherrean Carr  
Representative: Roy Horn, Filed: 05.02.23

B. **206 Hollister Avenue**  
Permit Number: #23-0003  
APN: 036-125-10  
Design Permit to demolish an existing cottage and detached garage and build a new two-story, single-family residence and detached, single-story ADU, located within the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district.  
This project is in the Coastal Zone and requires a Coastal Development Permit, which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission after all possible appeals are exhausted through the City.  
Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption 15303(A) New Construction  
Property Owner: Muhamed Causevic  
Representative: Muhamed Causevic, Filed: 01.03.2023

5. **Public Hearings**

*Public Hearings are intended to provide an opportunity for public discussion of each item listed as a Public Hearing. The following procedure is as follows: 1) Staff Presentation; 2) Planning Commission Questions; 3) Public Comment; 4) Planning Commission Deliberation; and 5) Decision.*

A. **836 Bay Avenue**  
Permit Number: #22-0438  
APN: 036-011-17  
Design Permit to replace an existing gas station canopy structure and a Sign Permit with Variance requests for a new wall sign, located within the C-C (Community Commercial) zoning district.  
This project is not in the Coastal Zone.  
Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption  
Property Owner: Akhtar Javed  
Representative: Kurt Wagenknecht, John Sevo, Filed: 10.11.22

6. **Director's Report**

7. **Commission Communications**

8. **Adjournment**

Notice of In-Person & Remote Access

Meetings are open to the public for in-person attendance at the Capitola City Council Chambers located at 420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola, California, 95010

Other ways to Watch:
- Spectrum Cable Television channel 8
- City of Capitola, California YouTube Channel
To Join Zoom Application or Call in to Zoom:

- Meeting link: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84769092900?pwd=anpWVWlQamFzT3BGUm54QStJWTdwQT09
- Or dial one of these phone numbers: 1 (669) 900 6833, 1 (408) 638 0968, 1 (346) 248 7799
- Meeting ID: 847 6909 2900
- Meeting Passcode: 379704

To make a remote public comment:

- Via Zoom Application: Use participant option to “raise hand”. The moderator will unmute you
- Via Zoom phone call: Dial *9 on your phone to “raise your hand”. The moderator will unmute you

Appeals: The following decisions of the Planning Commission can be appealed to the City Council within the (10) calendar days following the date of the Commission action: Design Permit, Conditional Use Permit, Variance, and Coastal Permit. If the tenth day falls on a weekend or holiday, the appeal period is extended to the next business day.

All appeals must be submitted in writing on an official city application form, setting forth the nature of the action and the basis upon which the action is considered to be in error, and addressed to the City Council in care of the City Clerk. An appeal must be accompanied by a five hundred dollar ($500) filing fee, unless the item involves a Coastal Permit that is appealable to the Coastal Commission, in which case there is no fee. If you challenge a decision of the Planning Commission in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the City at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Notice regarding Planning Commission meetings: The Planning Commission meets regularly on the 1st Thursday of each month (except July and August) at 6 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers located at 420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola. In July and August, the Commission meets on the 3rd Thursday.

Agenda and Agenda Packet Materials: The Planning Commission Agenda and complete Agenda Packet are available on the Internet at the City’s website: www.cityofcapitola.org/meetings. Need more information? Contact the Community Development Department at (831) 475-7300.

Agenda Materials Distributed after Distribution of the Agenda Packet: Materials that are a public record under Government Code § 54957.5(A) and that relate to an agenda item of a regular meeting of the Planning Commission that are distributed to a majority of all the members of the Planning Commission more than 72 hours prior to that meeting shall be available for public inspection at City Hall located at 420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola, during normal business hours.

Americans with Disabilities Act: Disability-related aids or services are available to enable persons with a disability to participate in this meeting consistent with the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Assisted listening devices are available for individuals with hearing impairments at the meeting in the City Council Chambers. Should you require special accommodations to participate in the meeting due to a disability, please contact the Community Development Department at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting at (831) 475-7300. In an effort to accommodate individuals with environmental sensitivities, attendees are requested to refrain from wearing perfumes and other scented products.

Televised Meetings: Planning Commission meetings are cablecast “Live” on Charter Communications Cable TV Channel 8 and are recorded to be replayed on the following Monday and Friday at 1:00 p.m. on Charter Channel 71 and Comcast Channel 25. Meetings can also be viewed from the City's website: www.cityofcapitola.org.
1. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance – The meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM. In attendance, Chair Westman, Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen. Absent, Commissioner Wilk.

2. New Business – None

3. Oral Communications
   A. Additions and Deletions to the Agenda – Request to move 5A to Public Hearing as Item A.
   B. Public Comments – None
   C. Commission Comments – None
   D. Staff Comments – None

4. Approval of Minutes
   A. March 2, 2023 – Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
   Motion to approve the 3/2/2023 minutes: Vice Chair Christiansen
   Seconded: Commissioner Estey
   Voting Yea: Chair Westman, Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen
   B. June 1, 2023 – Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
   Motion to approve the 6/1/2023 minutes: Vice Chair Christiansen
   Seconded: Commissioner Estey
   Voting Yea: Chair Westman, Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen

5. Consent Calendar
   A. 4610 Crystal Street
      Permit Number: #22-0396
      APN: 034-193-03
      Design Permit, for second-story additions to a single-family residence with a Minor Modification for the required covered parking dimensions. The project is located in the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district.
      This project is in the Coastal Zone but does not require a Coastal Development Permit.
      Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption
      Property Owner: Diedre McRobie
Conditions of Approval:

1. The project approval consists of construction of a new 550 square-foot second-story addition. The maximum Floor Area Ratio for the 3,040 square foot property is 57% (1,732 square feet). The total FAR of the project is 55.6% with a total of 1,689 square feet, compliant with the maximum FAR within the zone. The proposed project is approved as indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on July 20, 2023, except as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.

2. Prior to construction, a building permit shall be secured for any new construction or modifications to structures authorized by this permit. Final building plans shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Planning Commission. All construction and site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plans.

3. At time of submittal for building permit review, the Conditions of Approval must be printed in full on the cover sheet of the construction plans.

4. At time of submittal for building permit review, Public Works Standard Detail SMP STRM shall be printed in full and incorporated as a sheet into the construction plans. All construction shall be done in accordance with the Public Works Standard Detail BMP STRM.

5. Prior to making any changes to approved plans, modifications must be specifically requested and submitted in writing to the Community Development Department. Any significant changes to the size or exterior appearance of the structure shall require Planning Commission approval.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, a landscape plan shall be submitted and approved by the Community Development Department. The landscape plan can be produced by the property owner, landscape professional, or landscape architect. Landscape plans shall reflect the Planning Commission approval and shall identify type, size, and location of species and details of any proposed (but not required) irrigation systems.

7. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall complete landscape work to reflect the approval of the Planning Commission. Specifically, required landscape areas, all required tree plantings, privacy mitigations, erosion controls, irrigation systems, and any other required measures shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.
8. Prior to issuance of building permit, all Planning fees associated with permit #22-0396 shall be paid in full.

9. Prior to issuance of building permit, the developer shall pay Affordable housing impact fees as required to assure compliance with the City of Capitola Affordable Housing Impact Fee Ordinance.

10. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide documentation of plan approval by the following entities: Santa Cruz County Sanitation Department, Soquel Creek Water District, and Central Fire Protection District.

11. Prior to issuance of building permits, a drainage plan, grading, sediment and erosion control plan, shall be submitted to the City and approved by Public Works. The plans shall be in compliance with the requirements specified in Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 13.16 Storm Water Pollution Prevention and Protection.

12. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a stormwater management plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works which implements all applicable Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) and Public Works Standard Details, including all standards relating to low impact development (LID).

13. Prior to any land disturbance, a pre-site inspection must be conducted by the grading official to verify compliance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan.

14. Prior to any work in the City road right of way, an encroachment permit shall be acquired by the contractor performing the work. No material or equipment storage may be placed in the road right-of-way.

15. During construction, any construction activity shall be subject to a construction noise curfew, except when otherwise specified in the building permit issued by the City. Construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of nine p.m. and seven-thirty a.m. on weekdays. Construction noise shall be prohibited on weekends with the exception of Saturday work between nine a.m. and four p.m. or emergency work approved by the building official. §9.12.010B

16. Prior to a project final, all cracked or broken driveway approaches, curb, gutter, or sidewalk shall be replaced per the Public Works Standard Details and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department. All replaced driveway approaches, curb, gutter or sidewalk shall meet current Accessibility Standards.

17. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning 6 A.
Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation.

18. This permit shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance. The applicant shall have an approved building permit and construction underway before this date to prevent permit expiration. Applications for extension may be submitted by the applicant prior to expiration pursuant to Municipal Code section 17.156.080.

19. The planning and infrastructure review and approval are transferable with the title to the underlying property so that an approved project may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant to others without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the site on which the approval was granted.

20. Upon receipt of certificate of occupancy, garbage and recycling containers shall be placed out of public view on non-collection days.

21. Prior to issuance of building permits, the building plans must show that the existing overhead utility lines will be underground to the nearest utility pole.

22. Outdoor lighting shall comply with all relevant standards pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.96.110, including that all outdoor lighting shall be shielded and directed downward such that the lighting is not directly visible from the public right-of-way or adjoining properties.

Design Permit Findings:

A. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan, area plan, or other design policies and regulations adopted by the city council.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed project. With the granting of a Minor Modification to the required dimensions for covered parking spaces, the project secures the purpose of the General Plan, and Local Coastal Program, and design policies and regulations adopted by the City Council.

B. The proposed project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed project. With the granting of a Minor Modification to the required dimensions for covered parking spaces, the project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.

C. The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Section 15301(e) of the CEQA Guidelines exempts additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than 50 percent of the floor area of the structures before the addition, or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less. The project involves a
net increase of 375 square feet to a single-family residence which will increase the net floor area by approximately 29%. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

D. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The proposed remodel of a single-family residence will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

E. The proposed project complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070 (Design review criteria).

The Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application. The proposed project complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070.

F. The proposed project maintains the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood.

Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have all reviewed the application for the proposed project. The design of the home will fit nicely with the existing neighborhood. The project will maintain the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood.

Minor Modification Findings:

G. The modification will be compatible with adjacent structures and uses and is consistent with the character of the neighborhood or district where it is located.

The Modification allows the property to maintain the existing parking arrangement and capacity which is both compliant in terms of minimum parking spaces and similar to that of many properties of the neighborhood.

H. The modification will not adversely impact neighboring properties or the community at large.

The proposal maintains the existing parking capacity of the lot, which already complies in terms of minimum parking spaces.

I. The modification is necessary due to unique characteristics of the subject property, structure, or use.

The existing garage is located within the required side and rear setbacks. Modification of the existing garage to meet the depth requirement would not be possible without also meeting modern setback requirements, effectively requiring the complete demolition of the garage and partial demolition of the residence’s habitable space.

J. The modification will be consistent with the purpose of the zoning district, the general plan, local coastal program, and any adopted area or neighborhood plan.
The proposed parking arrangement provides the required number of on-site spaces and does not exacerbate any existing nonconformities. Although the existing garage is substandard in terms of required depth and current industry practice for height, it can still accommodate most modern vehicles.

K. The modification will not establish a precedent.

A significant number of single-family residences in the Jewel Box neighborhood have nonconforming setbacks because much of the neighborhood was built prior to the city’s incorporation and under different development standards. The Jewel Box neighborhood has a largely consistent size and shape of lots; however, the subject property is slightly narrower at 38 feet compared to the neighborhood average of 40-foot lot widths. The project also results in maintaining ideal functional parking opportunities.

L. The modification will not adversely impact coastal resources.

The subject property does not contain coastal resources. The proposed on-site parking arrangement will not adversely impact coastal resources in the area.

6. Public Hearings

A. 201 Monterey Avenue #C
   Permit Number: #22-0125
   APN: 035-185-06
   Revocation of a Conditional Use Permit for sidewalk dining at an existing restaurant (Castagnola Deli & Café) located within the Mixed-Use Village (MU-V) zoning district.

   This project is in the Coastal Zone but is not appealable to the Coastal Commission.
   Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption 15321
   Property Owner: Atlantis Properties
   Representative: Daniel Castagnola Filed: 3.21.22

   Senior Planner Brian Froelich presented a staff report providing an update to the revocation of the sidewalk use permit. As of the time of the meeting, applicant provided full payment of outstanding permit/rent fees and committed to following the City’s permitting process. Staff recommended canceling the revocation process and adding conditions to the sidewalk use permitting process in order to avoid canceled revocations in the future.

   Commissioner Estey asked for clarification regarding recommended condition 28.

   Chair Westman opened the public hearing. John, Capitola village resident, inquired about the sidewalk use fee’s purpose.

   John, Zoom participant, concurred with the previous commenter and criticized the uses of the Capitola Village commercial spaces.

   Motion to approve: Commissioner Estey

   Seconded: Vice Chair Christiansen

   Voting Yea: Chair Westman, Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen
Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval

1. The project approval consists of a Coastal Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit and Design Permit for the sale of wine and beer, sidewalk dining and outdoor dining in the side patio dining. The original CUP application #07-048 was approved on September 6, 2007, by the Planning Commission. An amendment to the CUP application #22-0125 was approved by Planning Commission on July 21, 2022. The Planning Commission revoked modified the sidewalk dining portion of the permit on July 20, 2023.

2. There shall be no more than six seats provided inside the restaurant.

3. Outdoor dining is permitted in an eight foot by 11 foot space in the side patio located within 201 Monterey Avenue; and three, two foot by two foot bistro tables immediately adjacent to the building within the public sidewalk. The tables, chairs, and umbrellas shall not interfere with a required five-foot sidewalk clearance. The table nearest the north entrance shall be limited to two opposing chairs parallel to the sidewalk. Tables, chairs, and umbrellas are prohibited on the public sidewalk.

4. Any significant modifications to the size and appearance of the structure must be approved by the Planning Commission. Similarly, any significant change to the use itself, or site, must be approved by the Planning Commission.

5. The application shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions.

6. Outdoor dining may occur between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. seven days a week.

7. The applicant shall maintain a current business license to operate the business.

8. Beer and wine consumption shall be limited to inside the restaurant and the patio area. No beer and wine consumption shall be allowed within the public right of way sidewalk dining.

9. Signage shall be maintained at the entry/exit to the restaurant and patio stating that “consumption of alcohol prohibited beyond this point in sidewalk dining”.

10. No new lighting or signs are approved with this permit.

11. Amplified sound is prohibited outside the building.

12. A restroom shall be available to customers at all times during business hours.

Sidewalk Dining Conditions of Approval

13. The Covid-19 temporary use permit for outdoor dining expires on September 15, 2022. To utilize the sidewalk dining after September 15, 2022, the applicant shall complete a revocable
encroachment agreement, in a form provided by the Public Works Department, for all approved
privately installed improvements within the street right-of-way.

14. Prior to use beyond September 15, 2022, compliance with all conditions of approval shall
be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of
non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the
applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development
Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission
consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit
revocation.

15. The sidewalk dining shall comply with all applicable requirements of Capitola Municipal
Code Section 17.96, the Zoning Code, the revocable encroachment permit, and all other
applicable laws, administrative policies, rules, and regulations.

16. The outdoor dining shall be consistent with the Local Coastal Program and not adversely
impact coastal resources, coastal access, and coastal views.

17. Materials and Furniture. The sidewalk dining must utilize high-quality, durable materials
that are compatible with surrounding development and can withstand inclement weather. The
application included black wrought iron tables and chairs, as well as two commercial grade
umbrellas. The tables, chairs, and umbrellas approved within this permit must be well
maintained. Any visible signs of weathering (fading, rust, holes, etc.) shall be addressed
immediately through replacement or maintenance. Faded umbrellas shall be replaced with a UV
rated fabric and not include logos, labels, or advertising. Upon Planning Commission approval,
the property owner will order new umbrellas to replace the existing faded umbrellas.

18. CDP Recertification Requirement. All CDPs issued for outdoor dining permits shall require
recertification by the City Council no later than three years after the CDP is issued, and every
five years thereafter. Recertification shall require a public hearing before the City Council. City
staff will initiate the recertification process by providing notice to the applicant of the hearing
date, at least thirty (30) days in advance of the public hearing. For a CDP to be recertified, the
City Council must find that the subject project is operating in compliance with the findings and
conditions of the CDP and in compliance with the LCP. The City Council may recertify, modify,
or revoke the CDP.

19. Signs. No new business signs are included in the application.

20. Stormwater Drainage. The sidewalk dining must allow for adequate stormwater drainage.
Sidewalk dining areas shall not block the drainage flow along the gutter line. Sidewalk dining
shall not block access into any drain inlet or other drainage/stormwater facility.

21. Utilities. The sidewalk dining shall not interfere with utility boxes, water hydrants, storm
drains, and all other related facilities.
22. Trash and Maintenance. The outdoor dining shall be maintained in a clean and safe condition as determined by the City, including as follows:
   a. All trash shall be picked up and properly disposed of.
   b. All flower boxes and planters shall contain live, healthy vegetation.
   c. All tables, chairs, equipment, and structures must be kept clean and operational.

23. Sound. Music and amplified sound are not allowed in an outdoor dining area.

24. Hours of Operation. Outdoor dining may occur between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. seven days a week.

25. Open for Use. All outdoor dining in the public right-of-way must be open for use a minimum of five days per week, except in cases of inclement weather. “Open for use” means that the eating or drinking establishment must have tables ready for customers to use the outdoor dining area when the establishment is open for business.

26. All street dining facilities may be subject to inspection by the City on an annual basis or as needed to ensure compliance with this section, conditions of approval, and administrative procedures.

27. The Community Development Director may revoke the sidewalk dining permit if payment in full is not received after 30 days of issuance of a notice of delinquency or if there is a lapse in providing proof of insurance coverage. The applicant may appeal the Community Development Director’s decision to revoke the permit within 10 calendar days of the decision by providing the applicable form and fees per Section 17.152.

28. Following any late payment, the applicant/owner will be invoiced annually in the following billing cycle. After two successive timely annual payments, the applicant/owner shall be eligible for quarterly payments.

B. 111 Capitola Avenue

   Permit Number: 23-0325

   Location: 2 parking spaces in front of English Ales

Coastal Development Permit, Design Permit, and Major Encroachment Permit for Custom Street Dining Deck for English Ales at 111 Capitola Avenue in the Mixed-Use Village zoning district.

   Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt

Property Owner: John Kettman

Representative: Peter Blackwell, Business Owner

Senior Planner Brian Froelich presented a staff report about the custom dining deck proposal at English Ales, 111 Capitola Ave. Staff recommended adding condition 25 to the permit.
Commissioner Jensen asked about the width of the deck extending beyond the façade of the building proposing use of the sidewalk and wanted to confirm that neighboring businesses did not object to the proposed use.

Commissioner Estey asked about the prototype umbrellas.

Vice Chair Christiansen asked for clarification about the location of the steel flooring plate used to allow storm drainage under the dining deck.

Chair Westman opened the public hearing. There was no public comment.

Chair Westman wanted to ensure there were no possible alternatives that would prevent the ramp from encroaching upon the sidewalk and commented that other dining deck designs don't have a similar encroachment. Senior Planner Froelich commented that other dining decks won't be impacted by graded streets and therefore do not use a similar design as is being proposed at English Ales, and Community Development Director Herlihy confirmed that these plans meet ADA requirements and the sidewalk encroachment of the ramp will be added to the findings.

Vice Chair Christiansen moved for approval with expanded findings. Commissioner Jensen seconded.

Chair Westman commented that she voted nay due to her opposition to outdoor dining on Capitola Ave in general.

Motion to approve: Vice Chair Christiansen
Seconded: Commissioner Jensen
Voting Yea: Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen
Voting Nay: Chair Westman

Conditions of Approval:

1. The project approval consists of a Coastal Development Permit, Design Permit, and Major Revocable Encroachment Permit for a custom street dining deck. The proposed custom design is approved as indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, except as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.

2. The Design Permit, Coastal Development Permit, and Major Revocable Encroachment Permit is transferable between owners so an approved street dining deck design may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant during a sale to the new property owner without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the parking space on which the approval was granted.

3. Prior to construction, a building permit shall be secured for any new construction or modifications to structures authorized by this permit. Final building plans shall be consistent with the custom design plans approved by the Planning Commission. All construction and site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plans.

4. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall complete a revocable encroachment agreement and provide a Certificate of Insurance, in a form provided by the Public Works Department, for all approved privately installed improvements within the unutilized street right-of-way.

5. During construction, any activity shall be subject to a construction noise curfew, except when otherwise specified in the building permit issued by the City. Construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of nine p.m. and seven-thirty a.m. on weekdays. Construction noise shall be
prohibited on weekends with the exception of Saturday work between nine a.m. and four p.m. or emergency work approved by the building official. §9.12.010B.

6. Prior to a certificate of occupancy, all cracked or broken driveway approaches, curb, gutter, or sidewalk shall be replaced per the Public Works Standard Details and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department. All replaced driveway approaches, curb, gutter or sidewalk shall meet current Accessibility Standards.

7. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation.

8. The street dining deck must comply with all applicable requirements of Capitola Municipal Code Section 17.96, the Zoning Code, and all other applicable laws, administrative policies, rules, and regulations.

9. CDP Recertification Requirement. All CDPs issued for outdoor dining permits shall require recertification by the City Council no later than three years after the CDP is issued, and every five years thereafter. Recertification shall require a public hearing before the City Council. City staff will initiate the recertification process by providing notice to the applicant of the hearing date, at least thirty (30) days in advance of the public hearing. For a CDP to be recertified, the City Council must find that the subject project is operating in compliance with the findings and conditions of the CDP and in compliance with the LCP. The City Council may recertify, modify, or revoke the CDP. The City Council’s decision shall be a final action. The project applicant, any aggrieved person, or any two members of the Coastal Commission may appeal the City Council decision. Appeal procedures for coastal development permits shall be as specified in Section 17.44.150.

10. Signs. A maximum limit of one business identification sign and one menu sign each not to exceed two square feet are allowed per street dining deck.

11. Stormwater Drainage. At time of building permit, the custom street dining deck must be amended to include drainage above the gutter and a hatch above the storm drain to allow for adequate stormwater drainage and access to the inlet. Dining decks shall not block the drainage flow along the gutter line. Dining decks shall not block access into any drain inlet or other drainage/stormwater facility.

12. Utilities. All outdoor dining shall not interfere with utility boxes, water hydrants, storm drains, and all other related facilities.

13. Trash and Maintenance. An outdoor dining area in the public right-of-way shall be maintained in a clean and safe condition as determined by the City, including as follows:
   a. All trash shall be picked up and properly disposed of.
   b. All flower boxes and planters shall contain live, healthy vegetation.
   c. All tables, chairs, equipment, and structures must be kept clean and operational.

14. Sound. Music and amplified sound are not allowed in an outdoor dining area.
15. Hours of Operation. Outdoor dining may occur between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. seven days a week. The city may allow extended hours for street dining decks for special events and holidays.

16. Open for Use. All outdoor dining in the public right-of-way must be open for use a minimum of five days per week, except in cases of inclement weather. “Open for use” means that the eating or drinking establishment must have tables ready for customers to use the outdoor dining area when the establishment is open for business.

17. Materials and Furniture. The street dining deck shall have high-quality, durable materials that can withstand inclement weather. All approved infrastructure shall be maintained including but not limited to tables, chairs, umbrellas, lights, heating equipment, etc. If signs of weathering (fading, rust, holes, etc.) are visible, the item(s) shall be replaced in-kind immediately. Faded umbrellas shall be replaced with a UV rated fabric and may not include logos, labels, or advertising. Overtime, if the applicant would like to modify the tables, chairs, umbrellas, lights, or heating equipment, they must first receive written approval from the Community Development Director or Planning Commission.

18. Stanchions. The portable stanchions and ropes shall not encroach into the sidewalk. They must be located on the street dining deck. Capitola Prototype Street Dining Deck. The portable stanchions and ropes shall not encroach into the sidewalk. They must be located on the street dining deck.

19. All street dining facilities may be subject to inspection by the City on an annual basis or as needed to ensure compliance with this section, conditions of approval, and administrative procedures.

20. The applicant shall provide the required (four) bike parking spaces via the in-lieu fee option. The in-lieu bike fee requires a one-time $200 per bike parking space fee and an ongoing annual $300 per bike space annual fee. The annual fee is subject to increase as authorized by the City Council. The applicant shall make the initial payment prior to issuance of Building Permits for the dining deck.

21. Planters. The custom planters shall be repainted to match the building, prior to certificate of occupancy for the dining deck.

22. Heaters. Each street dining deck may have free standing heaters. The free-standing heaters shall be uniform and match within each dining deck. The details of the street heaters shall be submitted with the building permit application.

23. The applicant shall modify the plans for Building Permit plan check to replace the proposed umbrellas and umbrella bases with prototype umbrellas with a maximum spread of eight foot six inches wide, prototype umbrella bases, and prototype string lights.

24. The plans submitted for Building Permit plan check shall show that the gutter is to remain clear for drainage and remove the portion of the facia board that crosses the gutter.

**Design Permit Findings:**

A. The sidewalk dining area or street dining deck complies with all applicable requirements of this section, the Zoning Code, and all other applicable laws, administrative policies, rules, and regulations. The proposed dining deck complies with all applicable standards of the Zoning Code and CDP. Conditions of approval have been added to ensure ongoing compliance. The minor encroachment into the sidewalk for the entry ramp is necessary to meet accessibility standards due to the steep slope of the street at this location. The ramp does not encroach into the minimum required sidewalk clearance area.
B. If located in the coastal zone, the sidewalk dining area or street dining deck is consistent with the Local Coastal Program, will not adversely impact coastal resources, coastal access, and coastal views, and has been authorized through a valid coastal development permit. The CDP applies to this proposal and the limited use of Village street parking for dining decks. The applicant is providing four bike parking spaces to offset the use of street parking.

C. The design of the sidewalk dining area or street dining deck supports a safe, inviting, and lively public realm consistent with the purpose of the MU-V zoning district as provided in Section 17.20.040 (Purpose of the Mixed Use Zoning Districts). The proposed dining deck provides an inviting and active place for guests and visitors to enjoy Capitola Village.

D. The sidewalk dining area or street dining deck materials include high-quality, durable materials that are compatible with surrounding development and can withstand inclement weather. The applicant has proposed all weather materials and items. The dining deck will maintain a quality aesthetic with regular maintenance, as conditioned to remove the proposed umbrellas and umbrella stands.

E. The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 15305 (class 5) and 15311 (class 11) of the CEQA Guidelines exempts minor alterations in land use limitation in areas with an average slope of less than 20%, which do not result in any changes in land use or density and projects that consist of construction or placement of minor structures that are accessory to existing commercial facilities and is subject to Section 753.5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. This project involves street dining decks within the Mixed-Use Village zoning district. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

Coastal Development Permit Findings:
A. The project is consistent with the LCP land use plan, and the LCP implementation program. The proposed development conforms to the City’s certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP) land use plan and the LCP implementation program.

B. The project maintains or enhances public views. The proposed project is located within public parking spaces (maximum 25) in the mixed-use village. The project will not negatively impact public landmarks and/or public views.

C. The project maintains or enhances vegetation, natural habitats and natural resources. The proposed project is located within public parking spaces in the mixed-use village zoning district. The street dining deck maintains coastal access. The street dining deck will maintain or enhance vegetation consistent with the allowed use and will not have an effect on natural habitats or natural resources.

D. The project maintains or enhances low-cost public recreational access, including to the beach and ocean. The project involves a street dining deck will not negatively impact low-cost public recreational access. For each parking space utilized for the street dining deck, four bicycle parking spaces are required, and the applicant has agreed to the in-lieu fee option.
E. The project maintains or enhances opportunities for visitors. The project involves a street dining deck and will not negatively impact visitor serving opportunities. The street dining deck will enhance the visitor experience providing additional opportunities for dining.

F. The project maintains or enhances coastal resources. The project involves a custom street dining deck and will not negatively impact coastal resources. On busy beach days, the additional seating will provide more opportunities for visitors to dine on a deck and take in the view and coastal feel of the village.

G. The project, including its design, location, size, and operating characteristics, is consistent with all applicable design plans and/or area plans incorporated into the LCP. The proposed street dining deck project complies with all applicable design criteria, design guidelines, area plans, and development standards. The project has been conditioned to ensure the operating characteristics are consistent with the outdoor dining regulations of the zoning code. The minor encroachment into the sidewalk for the entry ramp is necessary to meet accessibility standards due to the steep slope of the street at this location. The ramp does not encroach into the minimum required sidewalk clearance area.

H. The project is consistent with the LCP goal of encouraging appropriate coastal development and land uses, including coastal priority development and land uses (i.e., visitor serving development and public access and recreation). The project involves a street dining deck design for future development of up to 25 parking spaces within the mixed-use village zoning district. The project is consistent with the LCP goals for appropriate coastal development and land uses. The use is an allowed use consistent with the mixed-use village zoning district.

**Major Revocable Encroachment Permit Findings:**

A. The project’s benefit to the applicant and community exceed the detriment to the community. The City has determined that street dining decks, in a limited implementation, are a net benefit to the Capitola Village. The loss of parking is mitigated by increased bike parking and enhanced visitor and resident opportunities to enjoy the unique and charming Village and beach area. The minor encroachment into the sidewalk for the entry ramp is necessary to meet accessibility standards due to the steep slope of the street at this location. The ramp does not encroach into the minimum required sidewalk clearance area.

C. **103 Kennedy Drive**  
   Permit Number: 22-0376  
   APN: 036-551-08

   Design Permit and Conditional Use Permit Amendment to convert parking spaces to an outdoor tasting area, bike parking, and mobile food vending more than four times per year.

   The project is not located within the Coastal Zone.

   Environmental Determination: Categorically Exempt 15332

   Property Owner: John McCoy

   Representative: Adair Paterno, Filed: 08.31.2022
Senior Planner Froelich presented a staff report regarding the outdoor dining proposal at Sante Adairius, 103 Kennedy Dr.

Commissioner Estey asked for confirmation regarding bicycle parking.

Vice Chair Christiansen asked about any possible drainage concerns.

Chair Westman opened the public hearing.

Adair Paterno, Sante Adairius business owner, commented about the history of this proposal and the impact that this outdoor dining space has on her business.

John McCoy, property owner, praised his tenant, recounted his experience of the transformation of the neighborhood since Sante Adairius opened business, and offered his support for this proposal.

Chair Westman asked about outdoor live music plans at the business.

Commissioner Estey asked about the change to allowable occupancy that this proposal would provide. Paterno answered that there would be an increase of approximately 50 patrons.

Manuel Viera, owner of the adjacent mobile home park, Cabrillo Mobile Home Estates, commented on the history of the property’s construction, use, and the impact this business has on his mobile home park and the surrounding area, including concerns about public drunkenness, traffic incidents, and other police calls for service. Viera requested the property use return to the original conditional use permit allowances.

Linda Viera, owner of the adjacent mobile home park, Cabrillo Mobile Home Estates, provided her opposition to the proposal, citing concerns about pedestrian traffic trespassing through the residential area.

Chair Westman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Jensen asked if any data or research has been gathered regarding the concerns presented by the Viera’s. Senior Planner Froelich commented that PD and the Police Chief do not have any concerns about the proposal.

Commissioner Estey expressed concerns about noise and the possible access to the adjacent private mobile home property.

Chair Westman proposed an added condition preventing live music outdoors, and a condition to add signage alerting patrons of the adjacent private property.

Motion to approve with added conditions: Vice Chair Christiansen

Seconded: Commissioner Estey

Voting Yea: Chair Westman, Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen

Conditions of Approval:

1. The current application is for an amendment to the 2011 Conditional Use Permit. Amendment is approved as reviewed by the Planning Commission on July 20, 2023, with the allowed modifications shown in strikeout and underline. The project approval consists of a Conditional Use Permit for a microbrewery with retail sales, tasting room, outdoor tasting area, and mobile food vending (Sante Adairius) located at 100-200 Kennedy Drive. The above-mentioned use shall allow the sale and consumption of food and beverages. No restaurant or table service is permitted without a separate conditional use permit.
2. Any significant modifications to the size or exterior appearance of the structure must be approved by the Planning Commission.

3. Delivery truck loading and unloading hours shall be limited to 7:30 a.m. – 8 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. Saturday, Sunday, and holidays in order to minimize noise impacts to neighboring residents.

4. All signs shall be consistent with the master sign program. The approved sign program shall permit tenants signage along the north elevation of the new building where the main entrances to the office areas will be located. Each of the five tenant spaces will be permitted one wall sign, with a maximum height of 20” and a maximum length of 8”. Signs are to be of wood or metal construction with vinyl graphics. These sign requirements will also apply to the existing building when new tenants are incorporated and the existing nonconforming signs are removed.

5. All businesses shall obtain a sign permit from the Community Development Department.

6. No roof equipment is to be visible to the general public. Any necessary roof screening is to match the color of the building as closely as possible. Plans for any necessary screening shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to, or in conjunction with, building permit submittal.

7. All lighting shall be focused downward and away from adjacent properties. The Community Development Department shall review lighting upon receipt of a legitimate complaint.

8. All uses shall be conducted wholly within an enclosed building, except for off-street parking and loading facilities, mobile food vending, and tasting in the designated outdoor tasting area. No merchandise shall be displayed outside the building without an individual Conditional Use Permit being issued for the business.

9. All businesses within the center shall obtain a business license and shall comply with all local and state regulations prior to commencing business.

10. Manufacturing and industrial processes shall use only gas or electricity as a fuel; provided, however, that equipment using other fuel may be installed for standby purposes only.

11. No owner or invitee shall use or permit any sound system including, but not by way of limitation, loudspeakers, public address, systems, sound amplifiers, radio, or broadcast within the project in such a manner that any sounds reproduced, transmitted, or produced shall be directed beyond the interior of the building towards the residential areas. This condition does not prohibit the property owner or business from applying for a Special Event Permit that includes live or amplified sound.

12. No vehicle used regularly on site and under control of a business owner or invitee shall be equipped with back up noise devices audible more than twenty feet from vehicle and owner and invitee shall encourage delivery vehicles outside of their control to approach the facility in such a way to minimize noise.

13. Hours of normal operation on site shall be 7:30AM until 8PM. The business may remain open until 10PM a maximum of six times per calendar year for special events. Special events shall only take place on Fridays or Saturdays. Vehicles coming and going at any non-business hours shall be quiet and conform to normal sound levels.

14. Equipment or machinery regularly used in the production of goods or services on site that produces audible at the property boundaries, including but not limited to sawing, cutting, grinding, shall require a Conditional Use Permit. Air compressors shall be of a quiet type and enclosed inside the building in sound containing enclosures.
15. Trash enclosures shall be covered, gated, and maintained to provide a clean and sanitary area.

16. Any outdoor washdown of equipment shall be prohibited.

17. The gate along Rosedale Avenue will be closed after business hours or by 9:00 p.m.

18. Signage will be placed on 100-200 Kennedy Drive, at the entrance to the mobile home park stating, “Not a Through-Street - Resident Traffic Only” and “Private property. Please be respectful of our neighbors and do not walk through the mobile home park.”

19. Prior to exercising the conditional use permit, the applicant must provide documentation of plan approval by the Central Fire Protection District.

20. Mobile food vendors shall obtain a Capitola Business License and any required county and state licenses prior to commencing business in Capitola.

21. Only one mobile food vendor shall operate at the property at a time.

22. Placement of food vendor vehicles or trailers shall not obstruct fire lane access, as determined by the Fire Marshal.

23. Placement of food vendor vehicles or trailers shall not obstruct vehicular right of way.

24. Mobile food vendors shall supply their own bird deterrent trash receptacles and empty them in the refuse collection areas when full and upon leaving the premises daily.

25. Mobile food vendor lighting shall be limited to lighting located on the food vendor vehicle or trailer. Lighting shall be in compliance with the Capitola Municipal Code.

26. Mobile vendor may not discharge any liquids including wash water onto the ground.

27. Mobile vendor must clean up any spills caused by their operation or customers.

28. Mobile food vendors shall be responsible for maintaining ADA access to the vendor vehicle or trailer.

29. Mobile food vendors shall comply with all sign standards in CMC Chapter 17.80. Specifically, mobile food vendors shall comply with the prohibition of portable signs in CMC §17.80.060(A)(2) and flag signs in CMC §17.80.060(A)(5). Signs will be limited to signage on the mobile food vendor vehicle and/or trailer.

30. Mobile food vendors shall not put out seating or tables for customers.

31. Mobile food vendors shall not utilize a loudspeaker or other amplified sound.

32. The applicant shall obtain a Building Permit for any ADA accessibility ramps, handrails, or other requirements for the proposed outdoor tasting area.

Conditional Use Permit Findings

1. The proposed use is allowed in the applicable zoning district. Outdoor uses and mobile food vending are allowed in the I (Industrial) zoning district with Planning Commission approval of a conditional use permit.

2. The proposed use is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, zoning code, and any applicable specific plan or area plan adopted by the city council.
The outdoor use and mobile food vending use is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, and zoning code.

3. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use will be compatible with the existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the property.
   The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use will be compatible with the existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the property.

4. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
   Community Development Department Staff, Public Works Staff, Police Department, Central Fire Protection District, and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project and determined that it will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.

5. The proposed use is properly located within the city and adequately served by existing or planned services and infrastructure.
   The proposed use is located within the City of Capitola and is adequately served by existing services and infrastructure.

Design Permit Findings:
A. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan, area plan, or other design policies and regulations adopted by the city council.
   Community Development Staff, the Development and Design Review Committee, and the Planning Commission have reviewed proposed outdoor tasting area and determined complies with the development standards of the I (Industrial) zoning district.

B. The proposed project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.
   Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application for outdoor tasting area and determined the project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.

C. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.
   Community Development Staff, the Development and Design Review Committee, and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The proposed outdoor tasting area will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

D. The proposed project complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070 (Design review criteria).
   The Community Development Staff, the Development and Design Review Committee, and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application. The proposed outdoor tasting area comply with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070.

E. For projects in residential neighborhoods, the proposed project maintains the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood.
   Community Development Staff, the Development and Design Review Committee, and the Planning Commission have all reviewed the application for the facade modifications. The project will maintain uses and operations that have been ongoing without complaint or issue.
D. 1855 41st Avenue

Permit Number: #23-0041

APN: 034-261-38, -52

Conditional Use Permit to allow Capitola Mall food court restaurants to sell beer and wine within the designated food court area. The project is located within the C-R (Regional Commercial) zoning district.

The project is not located within the Coastal Zone.

Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption

Property Owner: Merlone Geier

Representative: Brian Kirk, Filed: 02.03.23

Associate Planner Sesanto presented a staff report regarding the proposal of a conditional use permit to allow the sale of beer and wine at the food court at Capitola Mall, 1855 41st Ave.

Commissioner Estey asked for clarification regarding to-go sales and how to avoid to-go beverages being consumed elsewhere in the mall. Associate Planner Sesanto offered clarification citing ABC code.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the history of alcohol licenses at the food court.

Chair Westman opened the public hearing.

Brian Kirk, General Manager at Capitola Mall, answered Commissioner Jensen’s question about the history of alcoholic beverage permits at the food court and offered his appreciation for consideration of this permit. He commented on the effect that this proposal would have on the tenants and the mall itself.

Vice Chair Christiansen moved approval. Commissioner Jensen Seconded.

Motion to approve: Vice Chair Christiansen

Seconded: Commissioner Jensen

Voting Yea: Chair Westman, Vice Chair Christiansen, Commissioner Estey, Commissioner Jensen

Conditions of Approval:

1. The project approval consists of a Conditional Use Permit for the sale and consumption of beer and wine by Capitola Mall food court restaurants within the designated shared seating area. The project is located within the C-R (Regional Commercial) Zoning District. Eligible tenant spaces and the designated alcohol area is limited to the areas indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on July 20, 2023, except as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.

2. No open alcoholic containers may leave the designated area.

3. Alcohol sales are permitted during primary mall operating hours unless the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control places stricter requirements.

4. In order to be eligible, businesses must be considered a restaurant (bona fide eating place) by the Capitola Planning Director and the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC). All uses that sell or dispense alcoholic beverages shall require an ABC license.
5. Prior to obtaining an ABC license, each participating business shall obtain a letter from the Chief of Police either a Letter of Public Necessity and Convenience or written determination that a PCN is not required.

6. Businesses seeking ABC licenses shall participate in an employee program, with curriculum that includes not only business-related activities but also a section on ABC laws. Businesses must show ongoing commitment to training employees and agree to take part in future ABC LEADS (Licensee Education on Alcohol and Drugs) workshops.

7. The applicant shall install visible signage at all exits from the Food Court stating that “no alcoholic beverages beyond this point” and any additional signage required by local, state, or federal law or code.

8. Alcoholic beverage supplies, including kegs, and unsold alcohol products shall be kept indoors and in secure locations and at all times.

9. The Planning Department shall perform a final inspection, prior to initiating beer and wine sales for each tenant. Prior to the Planning Department final inspection, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

10. The planning and infrastructure review and approval are transferable with the title to the underlying property so that an approved project may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant to others without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the site on which the approval was granted.

11. This permit shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance. The applicant shall have an approved building permit and construction underway before this date to prevent permit expiration. Applications for extension may be submitted by the applicant prior to expiration pursuant to Municipal Code section 17.156.080.

12. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval, applicable municipal or ABC provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation in the manner provided in CMC §17.156.110.

Conditional Use Permit Findings:
A. The proposed use is allowed in the applicable zoning district. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project use and determined the proposed alcohol use is consistent with Conditionally permitted uses within the C-R (Regional Commercial) zoning district.

B. The proposed use is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, zoning code, and any applicable specific plan or area plan adopted by the city council. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed Conditional Use Permit and determined it complies with all development standards and meets the intent and purpose of the C-R (Regional Commercial) zoning district.

C. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed use will be compatible with the existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the property. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed use and determined it fits well with the existing food court and commercial center.

D. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
The Community Development Department, Police Department, and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed use and determined it will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare. Conditions of approval have been included to carry out these objectives.

E. The proposed use is properly located within the city and adequately served by existing or planned services and infrastructure. The proposed use is located along within the Capitola Mall shopping center and is adequately served by existing services and infrastructure.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Findings:
A. This project is categorically exempt under Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act and is subject to Section 753.5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines exempts the permitting, licensing, and minor alterations to existing private facilities. This project involves an existing commercial space with the addition of alcohol sales within the C-R (Regional Commercial) zoning district. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

7. Director's Report – Community Development Director Herlihy presented the Director's Report, commenting about the next August 17th meeting, the updated agenda format to be used in future Planning Commission meetings, and gave an update about the status of the HCD review of the Housing Element.

8. Commission Communications – Chair Westman commented that she will be absent on September 7th.

9. Adjournment – Meeting was adjourned at 7:11PM.

Attest:

______________________________
Austin Westly, Deputy City Clerk
Capitola Planning Commission
Agenda Report

Meeting: August 17, 2023
From: Community Development Department
Address: 1500 Wharf Road #7

Permit Number: #23-0228
APN: 035-194-05
Historic Alteration Permit first-story modifications to one of the historic Venetian condominium units, located within the MU-V (Mixed Use Village) zoning district. This project is in the Coastal Zone and requires a Coastal Development Permit which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission after all possible appeals are exhausted through the City.

Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption
Property Owner: Viola Carr and Sherrean Carr
Representative: Roy Horn, Filed: 05.02.23
Recommended Action: Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve application #23-0228 based on Conditions and Findings for Approval.

Applicant Proposal: The applicant is proposing a rehabilitation and 14-square-foot addition to one of the original Venetian Court condominium units, which is located within the MU-V (Mixed-Use Village) zoning district. The modifications require approval of a Historic Alteration Permit by the Planning Commission.

Background: The structure suffered substantial damage during the January 5, 2023, storm and flooding event. The unit lost all its front windows and a portion of the front exterior wall collapsed. Due to the shape of its walls and the funneling effect of waves, this is the second time the front wall has failed during a flood event.

Discussion: The existing structure is a historic, single-story residence, which is part of the larger Venetian Court condominium complex. The structure occupies most of the lot and shares walls with two adjacent condominiums. The unit is one of the most seaward residences in the complex and is currently uninhabitable due to extensive storm damage.

The applicant is proposing to remodel the existing residence, with exterior modifications on the front and rear faces, including a 14-square-foot addition on the front façade which removes the inset corner with a beveled wall to help redirect wave energy. The new wall will be reinforced using concrete masonry blocks to three feet above grade. Similar construction has protected the adjacent unit for decades, which likely receives even stronger wave action due to being the most seaward and exposed unit. The project will replace the destroyed windows with new fiberglass-clad wood windows with impact-resistant glass, restore stucco damaged by the storm, and introduce matching clay tile over the front addition.

Development Standards: The following table outlines the zoning code requirements for development in the MU-V (Mixed Use Village) zoning district. The project complies with all applicable development standards of the zone.
### Development Standards

#### Building Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MU-V Regulation</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 ft.</td>
<td>11 ft. 3 in.</td>
<td>11 ft. 9 in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Floor Area Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>MU-V Regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>484 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MU-V Regulation</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.93 (461 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>.96 (465 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MU-V Regulation</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Min: 0 ft. Max: 15 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft. 0 ft. Addition: 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 ft. Existing utility and storage encroachments 0 ft. Existing nonconforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>East: 0 ft. West: 0 ft. East: 0 ft. West: 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underground Utilities:** required with 25% increase in area Not Required

---

**Historic Alteration Permit:** The project involves substantial alterations to the existing historic structure and therefore requires approval of a Historic Alteration Permit by the Planning Commission. Also, historic resources are identified as environmental resources within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Any modification to a historic resource must comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards) to qualify for a CEQA exemption.

Originally constructed in the mid-1920s, the Venetians are an immediately recognizable landmark within the Capitola Village and are on local, state, and federal historic registers.

Architectural Historian Seth Bergstein evaluated the proposed design for compatibility with the Standards (Attachment 2), including the identification of character-defining features. Through the historic review, it was determined that all windows on the unit have been replaced and most window openings on the front elevation have also been modified. Although numerous features have been replaced or modified, the structure still retains a number of character-defining features, including:

- Flat roof with parapet walls.
- Decorative clay-barrel roof tiles over the parapet on the front and rear faces.
- Heavily textured stucco wall cladding.
- Decorative cement plaster relief details on the roof parapet.

After reviewing the proposed plans and conducting an on-site review with Planning Staff and project representatives, Mr. Bergstein recommended the proposed front entrance overhang be removed for historic consistency with the overall Venetian frontage. The entrance overhangs were removed from the final design. Subsequently, Mr. Bergstein cited Standards 2, 9, and 10 as most applicable to the project for the preservation of character-defining features and compatibility of new additions and exterior alterations.

Mr. Bergstein found that the proposed residential rehabilitation project has been designed to comply with the Standards and the front addition will minimize future damage and enhance the long-term preservation of the structure overall. Therefore, the project qualifies for a CEQA exemption.

**Parking:** Pursuant to CMC §17.76.020(C)(2), the full amount of parking to serve a residential use is required when the floor area is increased by more than ten percent. The proposed project will increase
the floor area by approximately three percent and is therefore not required to bring onsite parking into compliance.

**Non-Conforming Structure:** The existing residence, like many of the Venetian units, has utility connections and storage cabinets which encroach beyond the property line into the shared interior walkway that serves residents. The structure does not comply with the minimum required rear setbacks along the north property line and is therefore considered a legal non-conforming structure. Pursuant to code section 17.92.070, structural alterations to an existing non-complying structure may not exceed 80 percent of the present fair market value of the structure. Staff estimates the project cost represents approximately 50 percent of the present fair market value and therefore complies with alteration limitations to non-conforming structures.

**CEQA:** Section 15331 of the CEQA Guidelines exempts 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, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. Following the flood and wave damage, construction is necessary to make the residence habitable again. The expanded scope of rehabilitation will help defend the historic structure against future storms. Architectural Historian Seth Bergstein reviewed the project for compatibility with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and found that the proposed residential rehabilitation would not impact the remaining character-defining features or overall historic integrity of the building. Therefore, the project qualifies for this CEQA exemption.

**Attachments:**
1. 1500 Wharf Road #7 – Plan Set
2. 1500 Wharf Road #7 – SOI Review Letter

**Conditions of Approval:**
1. The project approval includes the rehabilitation of an existing 451-square-foot single-story, historic residence and a 14-square-foot addition. The proposed project is approved as indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on August 17, 2023, except as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.

2. Prior to construction, a building permit shall be secured for any new construction or modifications to structures authorized by this permit. Final building plans shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Planning Commission. All construction and site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plans.

3. At time of submittal for building permit review, the Conditions of Approval must be printed in full on the cover sheet of the construction plans.

4. At time of submittal for building permit review, Public Works Standard Detail SMP STRM shall be printed in full and incorporated as a sheet into the construction plans. All construction shall be done in accordance with the Public Works Standard Detail BMP STRM.

5. Prior to making any changes to approved plans, modifications must be specifically requested and submitted in writing to the Community Development Department. Any significant changes to the size or exterior appearance of the structure shall require Planning Commission approval.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, all Planning fees associated with permit #23-0228 shall be paid in full.
7. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide documentation of plan approval by the following entities: Santa Cruz County Sanitation Department, Soquel Creek Water District, and Central Fire Protection District.

8. Prior to any work in the City road right of way, an encroachment permit shall be acquired by the contractor performing the work. No material or equipment storage may be placed in the road right-of-way.

9. During construction, any construction activity shall be subject to a construction noise curfew, except when otherwise specified in the building permit issued by the City. Construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of nine p.m. and seven-thirty a.m. on weekdays. Construction noise shall be prohibited on weekends with the exception of Saturday work between nine a.m. and four p.m. or emergency work approved by the building official. §9.12.010B

10. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation.

11. This permit shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance. The applicant shall have an approved building permit and construction underway before this date to prevent permit expiration. Applications for extension may be submitted by the applicant prior to expiration pursuant to Municipal Code section 17.156.080.

12. The planning and infrastructure review and approval are transferable with the title to the underlying property so that an approved project may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant to others without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the site on which the approval was granted.

13. Outdoor lighting shall comply with all relevant standards pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.96.110, including that all outdoor lighting shall be shielded and directed downward such that the lighting is not directly visible from the public right-of-way or adjoining properties.

**Historic Alteration Permit Findings:**

A. The historic character of a property is retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property is avoided. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed rehabilitation project and determined it will it has been designed to preserve character-defining features and maintain the spatial relationship with the row of adjacent Venetian dwellings. The project includes necessary repairs and fortifies the structure against future damages, thus enhancing the long term preservation of the historic resource.

B. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of fine craftsmanship that characterize a property are preserved. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed rehabilitation project and determined that distinctive design will be preserved by reconstructing the signature stucco cladding that was damaged by the 2023 storms, and use of clay-barrel tile roof accents.
C. Any new additions complement the historic character of the existing structure. New building components and materials for the addition are similar in scale and size to those of the existing structure.
Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed rehabilitation project and determined that the addition will not modify the spatial relationships between the existing condominium units. The stucco cladding, stucco pattern, and structural massing are prioritized over differentiation. The addition is modest, similar in scale and size, and complements the overall character of the structure.

D. Deteriorated historic features are repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature matches the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed rehabilitation project and determined that historic features will be preserved and repaired to the extent possible. Stucco cladding will be replaced in-kind where damaged by the 2023 storm. Windows and doors on the front are not original and have all been damaged or destroyed by the storm; all will be replaced utilizing distinct but compatible materials.

E. Archeological resources are protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures are undertaken.
Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the proposed renovations and determined it will not impact archaeological resources.

F. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan, any applicable specific plan, the zoning code, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is subject to Section 753.5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.
Section 15331 of the CEQA Guidelines exempts 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, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. Following the flood and wave damage, construction is necessary to make the residence habitable again. The expanded scope of rehabilitation will help defend the historic structure against future storms. The proposed project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and no adverse environmental impacts were discovered by Planning Staff during the review of the proposed project.

Coastal Development Permit Findings:
A. The project is consistent with the LCP land use plan, and the LCP implementation program.
The proposed residential rehabilitation project conforms to the City’s certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP) land use plan and the LCP implementation program.

B. The project maintains or enhances public views.
The proposed project will not negatively impact public views.

C. The project maintains or enhances vegetation, natural habitats and natural resources.
The project will not interfere with vegetation, natural habitats, and natural resources.

D. The project maintains or enhances low-cost public recreational access, including to the beach and ocean.
The project involves façade improvements and a minor addition on private property. The project is located adjacent to a coastal access pathway but will not interfere with public access.

E. The project maintains or enhances opportunities for visitors.
The project involves façade improvements and a minor addition on private property. The project will not interfere with visitor-serving opportunities.

F. The project maintains or enhances coastal resources.
   The project involves façade improvements and will not negatively impact coastal resources.

G. The project, including its design, location, size, and operating characteristics, is consistent with all applicable design plans and/or area plans incorporated into the LCP.
   The proposed project complies with all applicable design criteria, design guidelines, area plans, and development standards.

H. The project is consistent with the LCP goal of encouraging appropriate coastal development and land uses, including coastal priority development and land uses (i.e., visitor serving development and public access and recreation).
   The project involves façade improvements and a minor addition. The project is consistent with the LCP goals for appropriate coastal development and land uses. The use is an allowed use consistent with the MU-V zoning district.

Report Prepared By: Sean Sesanto, Associate Planner
INDEX OF DRAWINGS

1 OF 2
1. FLOOR PLANS, ELEVATIONS - EXISTING & PROPOSED PLOT PLAN
2. CROSS SECTION
2. ELECTRICAL & MECHANICAL PLAN
2. STRUCTURAL DETAILS

TECHNICAL CONSULTANTS

DESIGNER: ROY HORN DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION, JOSI BACIO
DEL SOL, SONOMA, CA 95476

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER: DONALD LEFFRANDE ASSOCIATES, SANTA CRUZ, CA

SURVEYOR: BOONHAM & WILLIAMS, 310 RESEARCH PARK, SONOMA, CA 95476

ENERGY CONSULTANT: A PLUS GREEN ENERGY SERVICES, 41 MANOR WAY, WATSONVILLE, CA 95076

CARR RESIDENCE 1500 WHARF RD #7
APN 035-194-05

SOUTH ELEVATIONS
Sliding, fiberglass-clad windows with wood grain texture. Wood interior. Item 4 A.
July 26, 2023

Sean Sesanto, Associate Planner
City of Capitola Planning Department
420 Capitola Ave.
Capitola, CA 95010

Re: 1500 Wharf Rd., Unit #7, Capitola, CA – SOI Standards Design Review Letter
APN. 035-194-05

Dear Mr. Sesanto:

PAST Consultants, LLC (PAST) respectfully submits our Secretary of the Interior’s Standards Compliance Review of the property located at 1500 Wharf Road, Unit #7, Capitola, California. The subject property is part of the Venetian Court Condominium complex (circa-1925), also known as the Venetian Court Apartments and listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1987. The subject unit sustained wave damage during the significant 2023 California winter storm event.

Existing Site Conditions

On June 13, 2023 PAST Consultants, LLC (PAST) visited the subject property to view the existing conditions of the building. Unit #7 resides in the earliest part of the apartment complex facing the beach. The complex is constructed in the Spanish Revival style (Figures 1 – 4).

Figures 1 and 2. Two images of the front (south) elevation, as viewed from the beach.
The single-story apartment is part of a multi-unit apartment building that has a stepped front elevation, angled to take advantage of views to the ocean. The apartment has a flat roof with a parapet, clay-barrel tiles over the parapet, replaced windows and front door and troweled stucco wall cladding. The 2023 storm damage has destroyed the south (front) elevation wall and windows. The rear elevation faces an alley that services additional units to the east (Figures 3 and 4).

Figures 3 and 4. Two images of the rear (north) elevation, as viewed from the alley. The horizontal window (arrow) is not original to the building.

Sanborn Map Analysis

The 1933 Sanborn map shows the subject property (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Image of the 1933 Sanborn map, showing the subject property with an arrow.
The complex was designed by the San Jose architectural firm of Wolfe and Higgins and is their only known Santa Cruz County project. The subject unit is contained in the first structure to be completed (1925) on the site. Originally, the building contained two units, which have been subdivided. The present unit is a 400-sf, studio apartment. Original fenestration consisted of wood-framed, multi-light casement windows and French doors. All windows on the building have been replaced. The window openings on the south elevation were altered previously (Figures 6 and 7).\(^\text{1}\)

\textbf{Figures 6 and 7.} Top image is a circa-1950s image of the subject unit. Bottom image is taken from the 1987 National Register Registration Form. Note the conversion of a window to a front (south) elevation door and enlargement of window openings in the subject unit (Courtesy: City of Capitola Planning Department).

\(^1\) See Charles Rowe, \textit{Venetian Court Apartments, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form} (listed, 4/2/1987), for a complete inventory and developmental history.
Construction Chronology

Based on the Sanborn maps, Assessor records and historic images from the obtained from the City of Capitola Planning Department, the following is the estimated building chronology:

- Circa-1950s. Subdivide original apartment into two apartments. Modify original window openings; install new entrance door on south elevation.
- Circa-1980s. Install horizontal window on rear elevation. Replace window sash at a later date.

Remaining Character Defining Features

The remaining character-defining features are:

- Flat roof with parapet.
- Decorative clay-barrel roof tiles over on rear parapet of both elevations.
- Heavily textured stucco wall cladding.
- Decorative cement plaster relief details on roof parapet.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards

Two publications provide both the standards and guidelines for analyzing new additions to historic buildings for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:


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 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.²

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.

Proposed Project

The apartment complex has been subject to numerous storm events throughout its history. The subject building located immediately on the beach has been particularly hard hit over the years. The first major flood event, which struck the city in 1926, damaged the foundations of the subject building. The proposed project design offers design solutions to mitigate future flood damage.

The proposed project is presented in drawings by Roy Horn Design and dated 5/1/2023 and revised 6/21/2023. The proposed design includes:

- Reconstruct the failed south elevation wall by modifying the wall’s angle and connecting it to the projecting wall containing the entrance. This change will remove the right angle between the existing walls, which is where storm water flow has been directed in the past.
- Install new and smaller horizontal window, new overhang and trash/recycling compartment on rear (north) elevation.
- Retain and repair existing character defining features of the building.

Evaluation of Proposed Alterations

For the proposed alterations to the subject building, the following lists the ten Standards for rehabilitation, 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 building alterations will allow the property to retain its residential building use, in keeping with 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.*

   While the proposed south-elevation building wall modification changes the original angle of the building wall, the proposed change will protect the historic resource by preventing water from collecting at the building and causing further damage. The proposed building wall modification uses the same angle as the adjacent Unit’s building wall and will be finished in a stucco pattern that matches the original in texture and application method.

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 rehabilitation design does not add conjectural features or elements from other historic properties that would confuse the remaining character-defining features of the historic house, in keeping with this Standard.

---

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved. This Standard does not apply as no changes 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 rehabilitation design will repair and rehabilitate the distinctive stucco and decorative plaster finishes on the Unit, 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. Deteriorated historic stucco and decorative finishes will be repaired using established restoration techniques that will prioritize repair over replacement according to the Standards.

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 the existing stucco and decorative features will be minimal and not damage the respective substrates, according to this Standard.

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 on the site, based on an archaeological consultant’s report under separate contract.

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.

South (Primary) Elevation

The proposed modification to the south elevation wall will minimize further storm damage to the historic Venetian Apartment complex by routing storm water flow along the building, rather than funneling the water directly into Unit #7, which has occurred during past storm events. This wall modification does not modify any spatial relationships between the existing condominium units. Window modifications proposed for the south elevation are acceptable, as the fenestration pattern of this Unit has been modified previously. Differentiation is not the priority in this case, as the building is a collection of individual condominiums finished with a stucco pattern and decorative cement plaster details that unify the entire building composition.
North (Rear) Elevation

The proposed window replacement on the rear elevation alters a window opening that has been modified previously. Alterations to previously modified building elevations is acceptable according to the Standards. The proposed roof overhang is in keeping with the building’s Spanish Revival design and is at the rear of the Unit, where alterations are encouraged by the Standards.

The proposed 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 alteration to the front (south) elevation are not reversible; however, historic images of the Venetian Court Apartments reveals that the individual units have been modified at various locations throughout the complex’s history. The proposed front elevation modifications will protect the historic resource and its environment.

The proposed roof overhang on the rear elevation is reversible and if it was removed, all aspects of historic integrity will remain on the site, in keeping with this Standard.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed design alterations to Unit #7 in the Venetian Court Apartment complex meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposed design does not impact the remaining character-defining features or overall historic integrity of the subject property. Because the proposed alterations to the building meet the Standards, 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).

Please contact me with any questions regarding this design review letter.

Sincerely,

Seth A. Bergstein
Principal
Capitola Planning Commission
Agenda Report
Meeting: August 17, 2023
From: Community Development Department
Address: 206 Hollister Avenue

Permit Number: #23-0003
APN: 036-125-10
Design Permit to demolish an existing cottage and detached garage and build a new two-story, single-family residence and detached, single-story ADU, located within the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district.
This project is in the Coastal Zone and requires a Coastal Development Permit, which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission after all possible appeals are exhausted through the City.

Environmental Determination: Categorial Exemption 15303(A) New Construction

Property Owner: Muhamed Causevic
Representative: Muhamed Causevic, Filed: 01.03.2023
Recommended Action: Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve application #23-0003 according to the Conditions and Findings for Approval and deny the request to remove a mature palm tree.

Applicant Proposal: The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing cottage and detached garage to build a new, two-story residence with a single-story detached ADU in the rear yard. The proposal includes a single car garage and one tandem parking space in the driveway. The proposal also includes a request to remove a palm tree near the boundary of the property at 204 Hollister Avenue.

Background: In 2022, the properties at 204 and 206 Hollister were removed from Capitola’s 2005 Historic Structures List after an independent consultant concluded that the properties were not eligible to be listed resources.

On August 9, 2023, Development and Design Review Staff reviewed the application and provided the applicant with the following direction:

Public Works Representative, Erika Senyk: Advised the applicant about Public Works conditions of approval and addition drainage and erosion control details that will be required with the Building Permit plans.

Building Inspector, Eric Martin: Advised the applicant that a utility plan will be needed with the plans for Building permit plan check.

Senior Planner, Brian Froelich: Requested that the applicant provide additional front yard landscaping details and information of exterior color and materials.

The applicant agreed to provide additional landscaping detail and color and material information, prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Development Standards: The following table outlines the development standards in the R-1 Zoning District.
Development Standards

Building Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-1 Regulation</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>Proposed for demolition</td>
<td>24 ft. (new peak)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot size</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>54% (Max 2,160sq. ft.)</td>
<td>54% (Max 2,160 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Story Floor Area</td>
<td>Proposed for demolition</td>
<td>868 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Story Floor Area</td>
<td>Proposed for demolition</td>
<td>1,026 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Garage</td>
<td>266 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>54% (2,160 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADU | N/A | 750 sq. ft. (exempt)

Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-1 regulation</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard 1st Story</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard 2nd Story</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard 1st Story South</td>
<td>10% lot width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard 2nd Story South</td>
<td>15% of width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard 1st Story North</td>
<td>10% lot width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard 2nd Story North</td>
<td>15% of width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>20% of depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yards ADU</td>
<td>4 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard ADU</td>
<td>4 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Encroachments | None |

Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (1,501 – 2,000 sf.) Limited Standards ADU exempt from parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 spaces total</td>
<td>2 spaces total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 covered</td>
<td>1 covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 uncovered (tandem)</td>
<td>1 uncovered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underground Utilities: Required with 25% increase in area | Required

Discussion: The existing property is a mid-block lot between Escalona Drive and El Salto Drive within the Depot Hill neighborhood, surrounded by one- and two-story single-family residences. The lot consists of an 800 square foot cottage and a 330 square foot detached garage proposed for demolition. The existing cottage was constructed around 1927 and was designated as a potentially historic structure in the 2005 Historic Structures List. In 2022, the prior owner applied to remove the potentially historic designation of the property pursuant to §17.84.040. City staff hired a consultant to evaluate the property. The consultant concluded that the property and structures were not eligible for listing as local or state historic resources (Attachment #2 – DPR).
Design Permit: The new home is proposed with a covered entryway and garage that faces the street. The design includes slate clad columns at the entry, a metal seam roof, and stucco siding. The ADU uses similar features of stucco siding and metal seam roof.

The applicant has addressed privacy from the second floor by use of several clerestory windows and opaque windows where the building wall is at the setback line.

The proposed primary residence and garage utilizes 100% of the property’s allowable floor area ratio (FAR). ADUs are allowed to exceed the maximum FAR for a property if they are under 16 feet tall, have four-foot side and rear setbacks, and do not exceed 800 square feet. The proposed ADU meets these requirements and is allowed to exceed the maximum FAR for the property per section 17.74.040(H).

Parking: The proposed habitable portion of the primary residence is 1,896 square feet and therefore must provide two on-site parking spaces, one of which must be covered. The proposal includes two full-size parking spaces: one tandem space in the driveway and one in the single car detached garage. The proposed ADU is a “Limited Standards ADU” per section 17.74.050 and does not require parking in addition to the primary residence.

Tree Removals: The existing landscape includes two mature palm trees and a turf lawn. The applicant proposes to remove one mature palm tree, estimated to be 30-feet tall or greater. This tree appears to be in the middle of what was a shared courtyard area but is now at the property line with 204 Hollister Avenue since the properties were subdivided in 2012. The proposed development does not appear to be impacted or limited by the tree. The Planning Commission has full discretion to allow or disallow tree removal when evaluating development projects per section 12.12.160. Planning staff is recommending that the tree removal not be approved as part of the project. The tree is not a limiting factor and appears to be healthy.

The applicant is proposing to plant two wax myrtle trees in the front yard. Pursuant to Section 12.12.180(C), the project must propose plantings that will secure the goal of fifteen percent canopy coverage. The wax myrtle trees, at maturity, would achieve the goal of 15%. The applicant has not submitted a full landscape plan for the front yard as required for new single-family residential projects pursuant to §17.72.020(B)(1). Condition #6 requires a fully developed landscape plan with irrigation prior to issuance of Building Permits.

Underground Utilities: The new home is required to underground their utilities per Section 17.96.120. Condition #22 has been included to ensure this requirement is enforced.

CEQA: §15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines exempts one single-family residence and accessory structures in a residential zone. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during the review of the proposed project.

Attachments:
1. 206 Hollister Avenue – Plan Set
2. 204-206 Hollister Avenue – DPR – Michael Baker International

Conditions of Approval:
1. The project approval consists of the demolition of an existing cottage and garage and the construction of a 2,160 square-foot single-family residence and 750 square-foot detached ADU. The maximum Floor Area Ratio for the 4,000 square foot property is 54% (2,160 square feet). The mature palm tree proposed for removal must remain, except as allowed pursuant to Section 12.12.180 for the removal of non-heritage trees. The proposed project is approved as indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on August 17, 2023, and as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.
2. Prior to construction, a building permit shall be secured for any new construction or modifications to structures authorized by this permit. Final building plans shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Planning Commission. All construction and site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plans.

3. At the time of submittal for building permit review, the Conditions of Approval must be printed in full on the cover sheet of the construction plans.

4. At time of submittal for building permit review, Public Works Standard Detail SMP STRM shall be printed in full and incorporated as a sheet into the construction plans. All construction shall be done in accordance with the Public Works Standard Detail BMP STRM.

5. Prior to making any changes to approved plans, modifications must be specifically requested and submitted in writing to the Community Development Department. Any significant changes to the size or exterior appearance of the structure shall require Planning Commission approval.

6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a detailed landscape plan shall be submitted and approved by the Community Development Department. The landscape plan can be produced by the property owner, landscape professional, or landscape architect. Landscape plans shall reflect the Planning Commission approval and shall identify type, size, and location of species and details of any proposed (but not required) irrigation systems.

7. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall complete landscape work to reflect the approval of the Planning Commission. Specifically, required landscape areas, all required tree plantings, privacy mitigations, erosion controls, irrigation systems, and any other required measures shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

8. Prior to issuance of a building permit, all Planning fees associated with permit #23-0003 shall be paid in full.

9. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the developer shall pay affordable housing impact fees as required to assure compliance with the City of Capitola Affordable Housing Impact Fee Ordinance.

10. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide documentation of plan approval by the following entities: Santa Cruz County Sanitation Department, Soquel Creek Water District, and Central Fire Protection District.

11. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a Minor Revocable Encroachment Permit for any landscaping or paving in the right-of-way. The revocable encroachment agreement shall be completed prior to project final.

12. Prior to issuance of building permits, a drainage plan, grading, sediment and erosion control plan, shall be submitted to the City and approved by Public Works. The plans shall be in compliance with the requirements specified in Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 13.16 Storm Water Pollution Prevention and Protection and incorporated into the submittals for Building Permit plan check.

13. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a stormwater management plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works which implements all applicable Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) and Public Works Standard Details, including all standards relating to low impact development (LID).
14. Applicant shall notify the Public Works Department 24 hours in advance of the commencement of work. A pre-construction inspection must be conducted by the grading official, or appointed staff to verify compliance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan.

15. Prior to any work in the City road right of way, an encroachment permit shall be acquired by the contractor performing the work. No material or equipment storage may be placed in the road right-of-way.

16. During construction, any construction activity shall be subject to a construction noise curfew, except when otherwise specified in the building permit issued by the City. Construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of nine p.m. and seven-thirty a.m. on weekdays. Construction noise shall be prohibited on weekends with the exception of Saturday work between nine a.m. and four p.m. or emergency work approved by the building official. §9.12.010B

17. Prior to a project final, all cracked or broken driveway approaches, curb, gutter, or sidewalk shall be replaced per the Public Works Standard Details and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department. All replaced driveway approaches, curb, gutter, or sidewalk shall meet current Accessibility Standards.

18. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation.

19. This permit shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance. The applicant shall have an approved building permit and construction underway before this date to prevent permit expiration. Applications for extension may be submitted by the applicant prior to expiration pursuant to Municipal Code section 17.156.080.

20. The planning and infrastructure review and approval are transferable with the title to the underlying property so that an approved project may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant to others without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the site on which the approval was granted.

21. Upon receipt of certificate of occupancy, garbage and recycling containers shall be placed out of public view on non-collection days.

22. Prior to issuance of building permits, the building plans must show that the existing overhead utility lines will be underground to the nearest utility pole.

23. Outdoor lighting shall comply with all relevant standards pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.96.110, including that all outdoor lighting shall be shielded and directed downward such that the lighting is not directly visible from the public right-of-way or adjoining properties. Building mounted lighting and lighting specifications shall be included with the plans for Building permit plan check.

24. Along with the plans for building permit plan check, the property owner shall submit a site plan showing all square footage of existing and proposed impervious surfaces and existing and proposed square footage of pervious surfaces. The plan should reflect the calculations submitted in the Stormwater Permit Project Application Form.
25. Before obtaining a building permit for an accessory dwelling unit, the property owner shall file with the county recorder a declaration of restrictions containing a reference to the deed under which the property was acquired by the present owner and stating that:

a. The accessory dwelling unit may not be used for vacation rentals; and
b. The accessory dwelling unit shall not be sold separately from the primary dwelling.

Design Permit Findings:
A. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan, area plan, or other design policies and regulations adopted by the city council. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The proposed single-family residence and ADU complies with the development standards of the R-1 zoning district. The project is consistent with the General Plan, and Local Coastal Program, and design policies and regulations adopted by the City Council.

B. The proposed project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application for a new single-family residence and ADU. As conditioned the project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.

C. The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section §15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines exempts one single-family residence and accessory structures in single family zones. This project involves a single-family residence within the Single-Family Residential (R-1) zoning district. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

D. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The proposed single-family residence will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

E. The proposed project complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070 (Design review criteria). The Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application. The proposed single-family residence complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070.

F. The proposed project maintains the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application for the single-family residence and detached ADU. The design of the structures with setback garage, standing metal seam roof, and stucco and stone veneer siding will fit in nicely with the existing neighborhood. The project will maintain the character, scale, and development pattern of the neighborhood.

Coastal Development Permit Findings:
A. The project is consistent with the LCP land use plan, and the LCP implementation program. The proposed development conforms to the City’s certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP) land use plan and the LCP implementation program.
B. **The project maintains or enhances public views.**
   The proposed project is located on private property at 206 Hollister Avenue. The project will not negatively impact public landmarks and/or public views.

C. **The project maintains or enhances vegetation, natural habitats and natural resources.**
   The proposed project is located at 206 Hollister Avenue in the Depot Hill neighborhood. The home is not located in an area with natural habitats or natural resources. The project will maintain or enhance vegetation consistent with the allowed use and will not have an effect on natural habitats or natural resources.

D. **The project maintains or enhances low-cost public recreational access, including to the beach and ocean.**
   The project involves the construction of a single-family residence and ADU in a developed neighborhood and will not negatively impact low-cost public recreational access.

E. **The project maintains or enhances opportunities for visitors.**
   The project involves the construction of a single-family residence and ADU in a developed neighborhood and will not negatively impact visitor serving opportunities.

F. **The project maintains or enhances coastal resources.**
   The project involves the construction of a single-family residence and ADU in a developed neighborhood and will not negatively impact coastal resources.

G. **The project, including its design, location, size, and operating characteristics, is consistent with all applicable design plans and/or area plans incorporated into the LCP.**
   The proposed residential project complies with all applicable design criteria, design guidelines, area plans, and development standards. The operating characteristics are consistent with the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zone.

H. **The project is consistent with the LCP goal of encouraging appropriate coastal development and land uses, including coastal priority development and land uses (i.e., visitor serving development and public access and recreation).**
   The project involves a new single-family residence and ADU on a residential lot of record. The project is consistent with the LCP goals for appropriate coastal development and land uses. The use is an allowed use consistent with the R-1 zoning district.

---

Report Prepared By: Brian Froelich

Reviewed By: Austin Westly, Deputy City Clerk
Approved By: Katie Herlihy, Community Development Director
APPLICABLE CODES

CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE (BC)  -  2022 EDITION
CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE (IMC)  -  2022 EDITION
CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE (IPC)  -  2022 EDITION
CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE (IEC)  -  2022 EDITION
CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE (CFC)  -  2022 EDITION
CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE  -  2022 EDITION
COC AND CITY OF CAPATOLA ORDINANCES  -  2022 EDITIONS
CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS  -  2022 EDITIONS

PROJECT DATA

APN: 036-125-100-00
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ADU FRONT ELEVATION

ADU LEFT SIDE ELEVATION

ADU REAR ELEVATION

ADU RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"
LEVEL LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1026.0 SQFT</td>
<td>MAIN HOUSE LOWER LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>817.9 SQFT</td>
<td>MAIN HOUSE SECOND LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>746.9 SQFT</td>
<td>ADU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>867.9 SQFT</td>
<td>ADU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>749.9 SQFT</td>
<td>GARAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266.1 SQFT</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING GROUND COVER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAINAGE PLAN

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"
NOTE:

Hereby surveyed as here shown, being the same as represented upon and included in the Map of Capitola, Block X, No. 1991, recorded in Volume 20, Map 8, Santa Cruz County, California, as well as the map entitled "Map of Capitola," recorded in Volume 20, Map 8, Santa Cruz County, California, as well as the map entitled "Map of Capitola," recorded in Volume 20, Map 8, Santa Cruz County, California.

All monuments utilised for field survey were found to be of sound material and occupying the positions as shown on said reference maps and are suitable for future survey to be referenced.

A. Title Report prepared by First American Title Company, Order No. 4402-6903107 was reviewed during the course of this survey. Per said Preliminary Title Report:

An easement for WATER, GAS, ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE LINES and incidental purposes in the document recorded 9/06/1927 as Book 97 Page 64 of Official Records of Santa Cruz County encumbers this parcel. The location of said easement cannot be determined from record information.

The terms and provisions contained in the document entitled "PERMIT AND AGREEMENT TO ABIDE BY TERMS OF PERMIT TO CONTINUE NONCONFORMING USE" recorded 2/27/1986 as INSTRUMENT NO. 1986-0010557 Official Records, Santa Cruz County has not been reviewed by ALCON ENGINEERING. Any impact upon subject parcel per this document has not been investigated or determined by ALCON ENGINEERING.
P1. Other Identifier: N/A

P2. Location: ☒ Unrestricted
   *a. County: Santa Cruz
   *b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Soquel, Calif.  Date 1954 (rev. 1994)  T 1S; R 11W; Rancho Shoquel; M.D.B.M
   c. Address: 206 Hollister Avenue  City: Capitola  Zip: 95010
   d. UTM: Zone 10S, 593741mE/4092635mN
   e. Other Locational Data: APN 036-125-09 and 036-125-10

P3a. Description:
This bungalow court, identified as 204 (APN 036-125-09) and 206 Hollister Avenue (APN 036-125-10), spans two adjacent legal parcels in the Depot Hill neighborhood of Capitola, California (Photograph 1). The two properties, which historically shared a single address (206 Hollister Avenue), were subdivided in 2012 (Kirk 2019). The properties are oriented on an angled, southwest-to-northeast axis on the east side of Hollister Avenue between Escalona Drive to the north and El Salto Drive to the south. The complex is entered through a gated opening at the center of a picket fence paralleling Hollister Avenue. A grassy common area with mature palm trees occupies the center of the court and is flanked by dwelling units on its northwest and southeast sides (Photograph 2) (Figure 1). Narrow concrete paths connect each of the six vernacular, gabled buildings that make up the court. Aerial photographs indicate that the pathway linking the buildings at 206 Hollister Avenue was shortened following the subdivision (Figure 2 through Figure 6). Other physical changes to the site include demolition of a laundry building at the north corner of 206 Hollister Avenue prior to 2013 (Figure 4) and removal of a diamond-shaped planter surrounding the palm tree at the center of the court around 2015 (Figure 5) (see Continuation Sheets).

P3b. Resource Attributes:  HP3. Multiple Family Property

P4. Resources Present: ☒ Building

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

Photograph 1: See P5b for caption.

P5b. Description of Photo:

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:
☒ Historic
1927 (Santa Cruz Evening News 1927a)

P7. Owner and Address:
Mark J. Peterson (APN 036-125-09)
206 Hollister Avenue, Unit 4
Capitola, CA 94619

Davis Steven (APN 036-125-10)
4848 McDonnell Avenue
Oakland, CA 94619

P8. Recorded by:
Alec Vybiral and Michelle Van Meter
Michael Baker International
2729 Prospect Park Drive, #220
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

P9. Date Recorded: June 22, 2022

P10. Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian

P11. Report Citation: N/A

Attachments: ☒ Building, Structure, and Object Record ☒ Location Map ☒ Continuation Sheet
B1. Historic Name: 206 Hollister Avenue; Capitola Apartments; Silver Gull Apartments; East Cliff Cottage Court; Linda’s Court; Gemini Court

B2. Common Name: 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue (renumbered in 2012)

B3. Original Use: Residential

B4. Present Use: Residential

*B5. Architectural Style: Craftsman; Vernacular; Bungalow Court

*B6. Construction History:

Bungalow court comprising four residential buildings (Units A-D), a garage, and a laundry building constructed in 1927; garage severely damaged by the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989 and rebuilt with a new door during the early 1990s; various building exterior renovations carried out between 2006 and 2007 including replacement of doors and windows, throughout; property subdivided in 2012; laundry building demolished prior to 2013; landscaping modifications including changes to walkways and removal of a diamond-shaped planter carried out between about 2013 and 2017.

*B7. Moved?: ☒ No

Date: N/A

Original Location: N/A

*B8. Related Features: N/A

B9a. Architect: Unknown

b. Builder: James Butterworth

*B10. Significance: Theme: Architecture; Development

Area: Capitola, California

Period of Significance: 1927

Property Type: Bungalow Court

Applicable Criteria: N/A

Early History

During the mid-1850s, German-born immigrant Frederick Augustus Hihn acquired Soquel Landing and an additional 2,500 acres in the immediate vicinity, including the land that constitutes present-day Capitola. The first wharf was erected along Soquel Cove between 1857 and 1858, and railroad access reached the area by the mid-1870s (Swift 2004, n.d.) (see Continuation Sheets).

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: N/A

*B12. References: (See Continuation Sheets)

B13. Remarks: N/A

*B14. Evaluator:

Michelle Van Meter, Architectural Historian
Michael Baker International
2729 Prospect Park Drive, #220
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

*Date of Evaluation: June 24, 2022

(This space reserved for official comments.)
Figure 1: Aerial view of the subject property with the extant building footprints denoted in yellow (Google Earth 2020).
Photograph 2: Grassy common space at the center of the bungalow court. Camera facing northeast, June 22, 2022.

Figure 2: Aerial view of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue captured on June 30, 2003. Note the configuration of the original landscaping plan and the presence of a small building or structure at the north corner of 204 Hollister Avenue, location denoted by the red circle (Google Earth 2003).
Figure 3: Aerial view of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue captured on May 5, 2012, around the time of the subdivision (Google Earth 2012).

Figure 4: Aerial view of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue captured on April 15, 2013. Note the removal of the laundry building at the north corner of 204 Hollister Avenue, former location denoted by the red circle (Google Earth 2013).
Figure 5: Aerial view of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue captured on March 28, 2015. Note the removal of the diamond-shaped planter at the center of the court, former location denoted by the red circle (Google Earth 2015).

Figure 6: Aerial view of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue captured on September 1, 2017. Note the removal of a portion of the concrete path connecting the buildings at 206 Hollister Avenue, former location denoted by the red circle (Google Earth 2017).
Units A-D

The subject bungalow court includes four nearly identical residential buildings (Units A-D) (Figure 1) (Photograph 3 through Photograph 5). Unit A historically housed an administrative office and a dwelling, whereas Units B-D each contained two apartment units. All four buildings have rectangular footprints set on concrete perimeter foundations. Each is topped with a low-pitch, front-gable roof with narrow, open eaves. The roofing material is composition shingles. The building exteriors are clad with round-edge bevel siding and corner boards. The primary gable ends of the buildings facing the internal grassy common space include two entrances sheltered beneath corrugated metal awnings supported on knee-brace brackets. Concrete steps lead to entries, each of which are fitted with modern hollow-core doors and, in some cases, modern screen doors. Other fenestration includes wood double-hung and fixed-sash windows with wide wood surrounds. Modern vinyl-sash screens are installed on many of the windows. Rectangular louvered vents punctuate the gable peaks.

Photograph 3: Unit B (left) and Unit A (right) at 204 Hollister Avenue. Camera facing south, June 22, 2022.

Photograph 5: Unit D, located at 206 Hollister Avenue. Camera facing north, June 22, 2022.
Garage

This single-car garage is located at the western edge of 206 Hollister Avenue (Figure 1) (Photograph 6 through Photograph 8). This rectangular-plan building has a low-pitch, front-gable roof sheathed in composition shingles. The building is sided with round-edge beveled wood boards and corner boards. A non-original tilt-up, paneled wood door serves as the vehicle entrance on the primary, southwest gable end, which adjoins the street front. The vehicle bay was originally fitted with a pair of double doors—the current door was installed during the garage reconstruction that took place during the early 1990s (Kirk 2019). A secondary entry with a hollow-core door is located on the rear, northeast gable end. The northwest and southeast sides of the garage feature no fenestration or ornamentation.

Photograph 6: Southwest façade of the garage, showing tilt-up, paneled wood door. Camera facing northeast, June 22, 2022.
Photograph 7: Garage viewed from the north corner, showing secondary entrance on the northeast gable end of the building and lack of fenestration on the northwest side. Camera facing south, June 22, 2022.

Photograph 8: Garage viewed from the east corner, showing lack of fenestration and ornamentation on the southeast side. Camera facing west, June 22, 2022.
Storage Building

The storage building is located between Unit B and Unit C at 204 Hollister Avenue (Figure 1) (Photograph 9 through Photograph 11). Similar in massing to the garage, this rectangular-plan building has a concrete foundation and a low-pitch gable roof covered in composition shingles. The siding material is round-edge beveled wood boards finished with corner boards. An original tilt-up, paneled wood door serves as the vehicle entrance on the primary, southwest gable end, which adjoins the street front. Entrances set below corrugated metal awnings are located on the southeast and northwest sides of the building. Double-hung, wood-sash windows are positioned on the southwest gable end and the southeast side. The rear, northeast gable end was not accessible at the time of survey.

Photograph 9: Storage building viewed from the west corner, showing fenestration on the northwest gable end and the southwest side, including the primary entrance. Camera facing east, June 22, 2022.

Photograph 10: Storage building viewed from the north corner, showing fenestration on the northwest gable end and the secondary entrance on the northeast side. Camera facing south, June 22, 2022.
Photograph 11: Detail view of the paneled wood door at the secondary entrance to the storage building. Camera facing south, June 22, 2022.
*B10. Significance (continued):

**Growth of the City of Capitola**

From its very earliest years of development, visitors flocked to Capitola to escape the intense summer heat of inland parts of the state. In 1869, Hihn leased a portion of the waterfront to Samuel Alonzo Hall, who in 1874 established Camp Capitola, the oldest seaside resort on the California coast. Hihn assumed control over the Camp Capitola enterprise and began subdividing his land holdings in 1882. Over the following decades, other tourist amenities emerged, including a hotel and a street car with service to Santa Cruz. Hihn died in 1913 and land speculator Henry Allen Rispin purchased Capitola from his estate in 1919. Under Rispin, “Capitola-by-the-Sea” expanded rapidly through the late 1920s. The onset of the Great Depression stalled growth during the 1930s, by which time the vicinity of the subject property featured a smattering of low-density, single- and multiple-family homes. Like many cities and towns in California, real estate development in Capitola experienced a resurgence following World War II as a result of wartime construction industries, expansion of regional transportation networks, and an abundance of available real estate. The City of Capitola was officially incorporated in 1949. Through the present day, service, retail, and professional industries, in addition to tourism, have supported the region’s economic base (Swift 2004, n.d.).

**Property History**

204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, formerly a single property, were developed by James Butterworth in 1927 (Santa Cruz Evening News 1927a; Kirk 2019). At the time of construction, the complex may have been called the Capitola Apartments or the East Cliff Court (Santa Cruz Evening News 1927b, 1927c; Kirk 2019). The earliest known depiction of the court appears in a Sanborn Map Company fire insurance map of Capitola published that same year (Figure 7) (Sanborn Map Company 1927). Historical mapping and aerial photographs show that the configuration of the original court has largely gone unchanged, save for demolition of the laundry building and aesthetic changes to the landscaping (Sanborn Map Company 1927; Google Earth 2003, 2020). The garage was severely damaged by the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989 and subsequently rebuilt. Major exterior alterations were carried out on all of the buildings between 2006 and 2008, during which time new doors and windows were installed. The laundry building on the property was demolished during the early 2010s and the property was subdivided in 2012 (Kirk 2019).

Butterworth sold the property to Charles E. Brandenburg in 1934 (Santa Cruz Evening News 1934). Soon thereafter, Brandenburg transferred the property to his wife Emily, who in turn sold the court to Clara Davis and Gladys Hayman in September 1944. The property was then transferred to Otto and Verna Barner and renamed the Silver Gull Apartments by 1946. David and Margaret Dick purchased the property in 1953 and changed the name of the complex back to East Cliff Cottage Court. Around 1960, Elmer and Mabel Doran purchased the court and the neighboring property to the east to develop the East Cliff Trailer Court, which is no longer extant. Carlos and Jennie Coronado purchased and renamed the property Linda’s Court in 1962 (Kirk 2019). Santa Cruz County directories and other primary sources identified multiple tenants on the property between 1927 and the present day; however, research failed to suggest that any individuals of significance lived in the apartments (Santa Cruz Evening News 1927b, 1927c; R.L. Polk & Co. 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981).

![Figure 7: Excerpt of a Sanborn Map Company fire insurance map of Capitola, California dated November 1927.](image-url)
Architectural Style and Property Type

The largely vernacular buildings of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue incorporate some minor elements of the Craftsman architectural style. Brothers and business partners Charles Sumner Greene and Henry Mather Greene pioneered the Craftsman style in Southern California around the turn of the twentieth century. Influenced by the English Arts and Crafts movement of the late nineteenth century, Greene & Greene began crafting artful “bungalows” in Pasadena beginning in 1903. The designs of Greene & Greene and their contemporaries gained popularity through features in magazines such as House Beautiful, Good Housekeeping, and Architectural Record. In turn, numerous small-scale, affordable adaptations appeared in nationally circulating pattern books and mail order house catalogs. Because of its widespread popularity and the availability of ready-made kit plans, the Craftsman style became synonymous with early suburbanization prior to the Great Depression. Identifying features of the style include low-slung, horizontal massing; low-pitch gable roofs; decorative gable vents; overhanging open eaves; exposed rafters, beams, and braces; full and partial-width covered front porches; heavy, often battered, columns and piers; and prolific use of wood, stone, stucco, and other local building materials to evoke connectivity and harmony with the natural environment. Windows, typically wood double-hung or casement sash, are commonly arranged in groups (McAlester 2013: 566-578; PHMC 2015). The subject buildings exhibit a few of these details, such as their massing, open eaves, and gable vents, but overall reflect a relatively simple, economical design scheme.

When considered as a collection of buildings, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue reflect the bungalow court property type. Also often attributed to Pasadena, bungalow courts proliferated throughout California and the nation during the first half of the twentieth century. The peak of their popularity occurred between about 1910 and the end of World War II. A unique solution to high-density housing, bungalow courts consisted of a collection of small, individual cottages on a shared parcel. These dwelling units were typically unified in their setback, landscape setting, massing, materials, and cohesive architectural style. Bungalow courts could be configured in a variety of arrangements, but most commonly centered around a shared, landscaped courtyard or walkway. Other character-defining features of the bungalow court property type include historic site features such as standardized light fixtures, driveways, sidewalks, fountains, and designed planted areas (Sicha 1981; Swift 2004; City of Pasadena n.d.).

Bungalow courts were a common property type in Capitola at the time of the construction of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, as they were cost effective for real estate developers to construct and manage and were well suited to serve as vacation rental properties. While this court incorporates some defining characteristics of the type, it is relatively simple in comparison to other more representative examples in Capitola. For instance, the buildings are oriented around a central courtyard, but the arrangement of buildings is not as distinctly symmetrical as other more sophisticated, contemporaneous examples. The shared common space features some deliberately designed elements, such as sidewalks connecting the units, but no other decorative flourishes such as fountains, statuary, or ornamental plantings. Although these vernacular buildings display some Craftsman-influenced details, they lack a distinct, cohesive architectural idiom that would have been typical of architect-designed bungalow courts of the time. When compared to other extant bungalow courts in Capitola, such as 104-106 Cherry Avenue, 116 Cliff Avenue, Venetian Court, and Riverview Tract, it is clear that 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue is a relatively modest example of the type, and the absence of a discernable design in their construction reflects Butterworth’s economical, efficient approach to development.
Primary sources and previous studies identify Butterworth, the original owner and a carpenter by trade, as the builder (Santa Cruz Evening News 1927a; Kirk 2019). Research through targeted searches on Ancestry.com, Newspapers.com, and other online databases did not reveal if Butterworth enlisted an architect for the project or identify any other notable buildings constructed by Butterworth in Capitola or elsewhere.

City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource Evaluation

The following includes an evaluation of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue for their eligibility for listing as a City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource pursuant to City of Capitola Municipal Code 17.84.060.A. This property was previously evaluated by Anthony Kirk, PhD in June 2019 and was determined ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), or as a Capitola Designated Historic Resource (Kirk 2019). The evaluation was peer reviewed and corroborated by Margaret E. Clovis (Clovis 2019).

The criteria for designating historic resources at the local level in the City of Capitola are enumerated under 17.84.060.A of the City of Capitola Municipal Code. The criteria are as follows:

1. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history.
2. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the uses of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
3. It is an example of a type of building once common in Capitola but now rare.
4. It contributes to the significance of a historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related groupings of properties which contribute to each other and are united aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Criterion 1 – Research did not demonstrate that 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, individually or together, reflects special elements of the City’s cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history. These adjacent properties, subdivided in 1922, are not directly or significantly associated with any period of Capitola’s history and are not known to have made a significant contribution to broader patterns or themes relating to local culture and history. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for listing as a City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2 – The vernacular buildings of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue do not embody distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction, nor do they individually or collectively constitute a valuable example of the uses of indigenous materials or craftsmanship. The design of the vernacular buildings at 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, constructed in 1927, demonstrate subtle references to the Craftsman architectural style, which was widely popular in the United States during the early decades of the twentieth century. These buildings are a relatively modest example of the style, built several years after the popularity of the style had begun to rapidly decline, around 1920. Neither their design nor the materials used in their construction possess high artistic value, and there are other, more distinct examples in Capitola that represent better examples of the Craftsman style. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for listing as a City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3 – 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue do not represent an excellent example of a type of building once common in Capitola but now rare. Collectively, the buildings of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are best described as a bungalow court, a property type that was developed in Pasadena during the early twentieth century. The arrangement of and the number of buildings, coupled with their simple, shared landscaping, are unexemplary when compared against other extant local examples, such as 104-106 Cherry Avenue, 116 Cliff Avenue, Venetian Villa, and Riverview Tract. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for listing as a City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource under Criterion 3.

Criterion 4 – 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue do not contribute to the significance of a historic area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related groupings of properties. The bungalow court was developed in 1927, by which time the development of lots on Depot Hill was well underway and the neighborhood was steadily growing. Since its initial development, the surrounding residential enclaves have continued to evolve and presently consist of buildings reflecting a variety of periods, architectural styles, and property types and that are not united aesthetically by plan or physical development. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for listing as a City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource under Criterion 4 either individually or as a historic district.

California Register of Historical Resources Evaluation

The following includes an evaluation of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue for their eligibility for listing on the California Register (OHP 2001). 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, individually and as a collective entity that historically shared a property boundary, have been evaluated herein in accordance with Section 15064.5(a)(2)-(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, using the criteria outlined in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code.
Criterion 1 – Research did not demonstrate that 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, individually or together, are associated with events significant to the broad patterns of our history at the local, state, or national level. The bungalow court was developed in 1927, by which time the development of lots on Depot Hills was underway and the neighborhood was steadily growing. The subject property, subdivided in 2012, is not directly or significantly associated with this period in history and are not known to have made a significant contribution to other broad patterns of local, regional, state, or national culture and history. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2 – Research failed to indicate that the subject property is directly associated with the lives of persons who significantly contributed to local, state, or national culture and history. Historical records reviewed revealed little information about James Butterworth, the original owner and builder, and there is no demonstrable evidence that any subsequent owners or tenants made significant contributions within the broader context of Capitola or their respective industries. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible under California Register Criterion 2.

Criterion 3 – The design of the vernacular buildings at 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue, constructed in 1927, demonstrate subtle references to the Craftsman architectural style, which was widely popular in the United States during the early decades of the twentieth century. These buildings are a relatively modest example of the style, built several years after the popularity of the style had begun to rapidly decline, around 1920. Neither their design nor the materials used in their construction possess high artistic value. Collectively, the buildings of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are not significant as an important example of the bungalow court. The arrangement of the number of buildings coupled with the simple shared landscaping do not constitute an outstanding example of the property type. There are other examples of bungalow courts in Capitola that represent better examples of the property type and style and, therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for the California Register under Criterion 3.

Criterion 4 – The built environment of 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue is not likely to yield valuable information which will contribute to our understanding of human history because the property is not and never was the principal source of important information pertaining to significant events, people, or architectural style. Therefore, 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue are recommended not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 4.

Conclusion – Lacking significance, the bungalow court spanning 204 and 206 Hollister Avenue is recommended not eligible for listing as a City of Capitola Designated Historic Resource or California Register. It is not a historical resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5(a).
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Capitola Planning Commission

Agenda Report

Meeting: August 17, 2023
From: Community Development Department
Topic: 836 Bay Avenue

Permit Number: #22-0438
APN: 036-011-17

Design Permit to replace an existing gas station canopy structure and a Sign Permit with Variance requests for a new wall sign, located within the C-C (Community Commercial) zoning district.
This project is not in the Coastal Zone.

Environmental Determination: Categorical Exemption

Property Owner: Akhtar Javed
Representative: Kurt Wagenknecht, John Sevo, Filed: 10.11.22

Recommended Action: Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve application #22-0438 based on Conditions and Findings for Approval.

Applicant Proposal: The applicant is proposing to demolish an existing gas station canopy and construct a new 1,913 square-foot canopy in the same location. The application also includes a new wall sign on the canopy which requires a variance to exceed the maximum number of wall signs and maximum sign area for the site.

Background: On November 11, 2017, the Planning Commission approved the construction of a new car wash adjacent to the existing gas station and convenience store.

On July 5, 2023, Development and Design Review Staff reviewed the current application for a new canopy with wall sign and provided the applicant with the following direction:

Public Works Representative: No comment.

Building Department Representative, Eric Martin: No comment.

Senior Planner, Brian Froelich: Informed the applicant that a variance would be required for the additional wall signage.

Following the Development and Design Review meeting, the applicant revised the plans to clarify the existing and proposed signs and submitted a variance request.

Development Standards: The following table outlines the zoning code requirements for development in the C-C (Community Commercial) zoning district. The applicant is seeking variance requests for the maximum number of wall signs and the maximum sign area.
Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC regulation</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory structures same as primary structures 17.52.020(C)</td>
<td>19 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>C-C Regulation</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>15 feet from curb or street edge and allows a ten-foot sidewalk along the property frontage.</td>
<td>19 ft. 4 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>85 ft. 9 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>North: 92 ft. 6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South: 63 ft. 9 in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The site is located along the Bay Avenue commercial corridor and is bordered by the Highway 1 on-ramp to the north, the U.S. Post Office to the east, and a commercial office building to the south. The site layout consists of a convenience store with a single gas station canopy in front and an automatic car wash to the north.

**Design Permit:** The applicant is proposing a 1,913-square-foot replacement gas station canopy at the Chevron service station. Pursuant to Table 17.120-1, nonresidential accessory structures greater than 300 square feet in size require a design permit that must be approved by the Planning Commission.

The existing canopy has a pitched frame with low vehicle clearance, which has resulted in repeated impacts by vehicles. The new canopy is proposed with a flat roof for a consistent minimum clearance of 16 feet and a total height of 19 feet, including the fascia panels. The canopy fascia panels utilize aluminum composite material coated with blue and white colored bands to match the Chevron franchise theme. Overall site landscaping was recently improved with the construction of the car wash and will not be altered. The existing pump stations will also remain unaltered.

When considering design permit applications, the Planning Commission evaluates applications to ensure that they satisfy the applicable design permit criteria of Zoning Code section 17.120.070(A-S), to ensure the proposed design satisfies the 19 listed criteria, to the extent the criteria apply. The design criteria are included as Attachment 3. In the staff’s review of the application, the proposed replacement structure complies with the applicable Design Review Criteria (Attachment 3).

**Parking**
Required parking is not affected by the replacement gas station canopy. The proposal does not remove existing parking and does not expand functional business areas or increase the number of pump stations.

**Sign Permit**
The property includes one 26-square-foot “Food Mart” wall sign on the convenience store and one 39-square-foot monument sign along Bay Avenue. The proposal includes one new “Chevron Hallmark” logo wall sign on the front elevation of the new canopy structure. The new sign is...
approximately 4 square feet in size. Pursuant to the sign code Table 17.80-1 and Table 17.80-6, the total signage for the site may be 1 square foot per linear foot of shopfront, not to exceed 50 square feet. The convenience store has a shopfront of 60 linear feet, which allows a cumulative sign area of 50 square feet for the site. Sign standards also limit the site to one wall sign. The cumulative signage results in an area of approximately 69 square feet and a total of two wall signs; therefore, a variance is required for both standards.

Additionally, wall signs are required to comply with the following underlined standards of §17.80.080(F):

1. Standards for wall signs in each zoning district are as shown in Table 17.80-6. Within the Community-Commercial zoning district, this includes up to one wall sign per shopfront, a maximum projection of 12 inches, and a maximum area of 1 square foot per linear foot of shopfront, not to exceed 36 square feet.
   Staff Analysis: The convenience store has a shopfront of 60 linear feet. The proposed sign is approximately four square-feet. The sign will project less than 12 inches.

2. Wall signs shall be attached parallel to the exterior wall of the business associated with the sign and may not extend above the top of building wall.
   Staff Analysis: The sign will be mounted parallel to the building's face.

3. Wall signs may be in cabinets, on wood, or on similar material attached to the wall or painted directly on the wall.
   Staff Analysis: The wall is internally illuminated and constructed with an acrylic face and metal cabinet, attached directly to the canopy fascia paneling.

4. Any portion of a wall sign that projects over any public walkway or walk area shall have an overhead clearance of at least eight feet.
   Staff Analysis: The proposed wall sign will be flat and provide 16 feet of overhead clearance for vehicles.

5. Wall signs are not allowed in conjunction with a monument sign on a property with three or fewer businesses.
   Staff Analysis: The sign code includes an exception for gas and service stations pursuant to §17.80.080(H).

6. On a corner lot, one wall sign is allowed per street frontage.
   Staff Analysis: There is currently one wall sign on the property. The applicant is applying for a variance for one additional wall sign on the canopy.

Variance
The applicant is seeking a variance to allow one additional wall sign and to exceed the maximum allowed cumulative sign area of 50 square feet for a total of 69 square feet.

Pursuant to §17.128.060, the Planning Commission, on the basis of the evidence submitted at the hearing, may grant a variance permit when it finds:

A. There are unique circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.
Staff Analysis: There are no unique circumstances applicable to the subject property due to the physical characteristics of the lot; however, the subject property is occupied by one business that operates with three distinct structures and commercial uses including a car wash, gas station, and convenience store. The combination of two to three uses is typical for gas stations within Capitola, with most having at least a convenience store. When compared to other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property, multiple businesses located on the same lot would be entitled to their own signage based on their individual shop frontage. For example, each business within the Nob Hill shopping center is permitted a wall sign.

B. The strict application of the zoning code requirements would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The Chevron and Shell gas stations at the corner of Capitola Road and 41st Avenue are located within C-C zoning and enjoy the privilege of multiple wall signs and cumulative sign areas in excess of the fifty-square feet limit. Each of these businesses has a wall sign on the canopy and the convenience store. The strict application of the zoning code would deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district.

C. The variance is necessary to preserve a substantial property right possessed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The variance enables the subject property to have signs similar to previous signage approvals by the City for gas stations in the same zone as the subject property.

D. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The variance involves a four-square-foot wall sign on the new canopy structure and will not negatively impact the public, properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

E. The variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Staff Analysis: The Chevron station at 1650 41st Avenue includes fuel pumps and a convenience store and was approved with a large monument sign and multiple wall signs for both the convenience store and the gas station canopy. The Shell station at 1649 41st Avenue has two pump island canopies, a car wash, and a convenience store and includes a monument sign, two canopy wall signs, a car wash sign, and a wall sign for the convenience store. Both sites are located within the C-C zoning district. Therefore, the variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege.

F. The variance will not have adverse impacts on coastal resources.

Staff Analysis: The subject property is located outside the Coastal Zone.

CEQA: Section 15302 exempts projects involving the replacement or reconstruction of structures and facilities where the new structure will be located on the same site as the structure replaced and will have substantially the same purpose and capacity as the structure replaced. The project involves the replacement of an existing gas station canopy in the same location and will not increase the number of pump stations. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.
Attachments:
1. 836 Bay Avenue – Plan Set
2. 836 Bay Avenue – Variance Letter
3. Design Review Criteria

Conditions of Approval:

1. The project approval consists of the demolition of an existing gas station canopy structure and the construction of a new 1,912-square-foot replacement canopy. The proposed project is approved as indicated on the final plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on August 17, 2023, except as modified through conditions imposed by the Planning Commission during the hearing.

2. Prior to construction, a building permit shall be secured for any new construction or modifications to structures authorized by this permit. Final building plans shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Planning Commission. All construction and site improvements shall be completed according to the approved plans.

3. At time of submittal for building permit review, the Conditions of Approval must be printed in full on the cover sheet of the construction plans.

4. At time of submittal for building permit review, Public Works Standard Detail SMP STRM shall be printed in full and incorporated as a sheet into the construction plans. All construction shall be done in accordance with the Public Works Standard Detail BMP STRM.

5. Prior to making any changes to approved plans, modifications must be specifically requested and submitted in writing to the Community Development Department. Any significant changes to the size or exterior appearance of the structure shall require Planning Commission approval.

6. Prior to issuance of building permit, a landscape plan shall be submitted and approved by the Community Development Department. The landscape plan can be produced by the property owner, landscape professional, or landscape architect. Landscape plans shall reflect the Planning Commission approval and shall identify type, size, and location of species and details of any proposed (but not required) irrigation systems.

7. Prior to issuance of building permit, all Planning fees associated with permit #22-0438 shall be paid in full.

8. Prior to issuance of building permit, the developer shall pay Affordable housing impact fees as required to assure compliance with the City of Capitola Affordable Housing Impact Fee Ordinance.

9. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide documentation of plan approval by the following entities: Santa Cruz County Sanitation Department, Soquel Creek Water District, and Central Fire Protection District.

10. Prior to issuance of building permits, a drainage plan, grading, sediment and erosion control plan, shall be submitted to the City and approved by Public Works. The plans shall be in compliance with the requirements specified in Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 13.16 Storm Water Pollution Prevention and Protection.
11. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a stormwater management plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works which implements all applicable Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) and Public Works Standard Details, including all standards relating to low impact development (LID).

12. Prior to any land disturbance, a pre-site inspection must be conducted by the grading official to verify compliance with the approved erosion and sediment control plan.

13. Prior to any work in the City road right of way, an encroachment permit shall be acquired by the contractor performing the work. No material or equipment storage may be placed in the road right-of-way.

14. During construction, any construction activity shall be subject to a construction noise curfew, except when otherwise specified in the building permit issued by the City. Construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of nine p.m. and seven-thirty a.m. on weekdays. Construction noise shall be prohibited on weekends with the exception of Saturday work between nine a.m. and four p.m. or emergency work approved by the building official. §9.12.010B

15. Prior to a project final, all cracked or broken driveway approaches, curb, gutter, or sidewalk shall be replaced per the Public Works Standard Details and to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department. All replaced driveway approaches, curb, gutter or sidewalk shall meet current Accessibility Standards.

16. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, compliance with all conditions of approval shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions, the applicant shall remedy the non-compliance to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or shall file an application for a permit amendment for Planning Commission consideration. Failure to remedy a non-compliance in a timely manner may result in permit revocation.

17. This permit shall expire 24 months from the date of issuance. The applicant shall have an approved building permit and construction underway before this date to prevent permit expiration. Applications for extension may be submitted by the applicant prior to expiration pursuant to Municipal Code section 17.156.080.

18. The planning and infrastructure review and approval are transferable with the title to the underlying property so that an approved project may be conveyed or assigned by the applicant to others without losing the approval. The permit cannot be transferred off the site on which the approval was granted.

19. Upon receipt of certificate of occupancy, garbage and recycling containers shall be placed out of public view on non-collection days.

20. Prior to issuance of building permits, the building plans must show that the existing overhead utility lines will be underground to the nearest utility pole.

21. Outdoor lighting shall comply with all relevant standards pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.96.110, including that all outdoor lighting shall be shielded and directed
downward such that the lighting is not directly visible from the public right-of-way or adjoining properties.

Design Permit Findings:
A. The proposed project is consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan, area plan, or other design policies and regulations adopted by the city council. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The proposed demolition and replacement of a gas station canopy structure with additional signage complies with the development standards of the C-C (Community Commercial) zoning district.

B. The proposed project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application to demolish and replace a gas station canopy structure with additional signage. The project complies with all applicable provisions of the zoning code and municipal code.

C. The proposed project has been reviewed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 15302 of the CEQA Guidelines exempts projects involving the replacement or reconstruction of structures and facilities where the new structure will be located on the same site as the structure replaced and will have substantially the same purpose and capacity as the structure replaced. The project involves the replacement of an existing gas station canopy with attached signage in the same location. The project will not increase the number of pump stations. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

D. The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The proposed replacement canopy structure will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity.

E. The proposed project complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070 (Design review criteria). Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application. The proposed canopy structure and determined it complies with all applicable design review criteria in Section 17.120.070.

Sign Permits Findings:
A. The proposed signs are consistent with the general plan, local coastal program, zoning code, and any applicable specific plan or area plan adopted by the city council. Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. With the granting of a variance for the maximum number of wall signs and maximum sign area, the proposed wall sign complies with all applicable signage provisions of the general plan, local coastal program, zoning code, and area plans.

B. The proposed signs comply with all applicable standards in Chapter 17.80 (Signs).
Community Development Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the application for the additional wall sign. With the granting of a variance for the maximum number of wall signs and maximum sign area, the project complies with the applicable sign standards of the C-C (Community Commercial) zoning district.

C. The proposed sign will not adversely impact the public health, safety, or general welfare. Community Development Department Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the sign application and determined that the proposed sign will not have adverse impact on public health, safety, or general welfare.

D. The number, size, placement, design, and material of the proposed signs are compatible with the architectural design of buildings on the site. Community Development Department Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the sign application and determined that the proposal is compatible with the architectural design of the buildings on the site. With the granting of a variance for the maximum number of wall signs and maximum sign area, the project complies with limitations on the number and total size of signage.

E. The proposed signs are restrained in character and no larger than necessary for adequate identification. Community Development Department Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the sign application and determined that the proposal is compatible with the architectural design of the buildings on the site. Site signage serves multiple uses, provides for adequate identification of branding and various services, and is comparable to similar uses within the City.

Variance Findings:

A. There are unique circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. There are unique circumstances applicable to the subject property that do not generally apply to other properties. The subject property is occupied by one business but operates with distinct uses: a car wash, gas station, and convenience store. The combination of uses is typical for gas stations within Capitola, with most having at least a convenience store. Were each use to be separate businesses located on adjacent lots they would be entitled to their own signage based on their shop frontage.

The subject property is adjacent Bay Avenue to the west and Highway 1 to the north, visually and functionally similar to a corner lot, although the northern side is a highway on-ramp and not a street. Corner lot gas stations are typically entitled to a second monument sign on the secondary street frontage.

B. The strict application of the zoning code requirements would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. State law requires gas stations to post fuel prices that are visible to motorists prior to entering the station, specifically limiting signage flexibility to all gas stations. Additionally, the subject property also operates a convenience store and car wash, but the zoning code does not afford additional signage because they are part of the same business on the same property. Most gas stations are located along 41st Avenue and are under a different
zoning as the subject property, however, each would be similarly impacted were they to seek new or additional signage.

C. The variance is necessary to preserve a substantial property right possessed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. The variance enables the subject property to include franchise branding which reflects multiple commercial uses and is similar to previous signage approvals by the City in the same zone as the subject property.

D. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to the properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. The variance involves a four-square-foot wall sign on the new canopy structure and will not negatively impact the public, properties or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

E. The variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property. The Chevron station at 1650 41st Avenue includes fuel pumps and a convenience store and was approved with a large monument sign and multiple wall signs for both the convenience store and the gas station canopy. The Shell station at 1649 41st Avenue has two pump island canopies, a car wash, and a convenience store and includes a monument sign, two canopy wall signs, a car wash sign, and a wall sign for the convenience store. Both sites are located within the C-C zoning district. Therefore, the variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege.

F. The variance will not have adverse impacts on coastal resources. The subject property is located outside the Coastal Zone.
CONSTRUCT A NEW FUELING CANOPY IN CAPITOLA, CA ON AN EXISTING SITE. ALL OTHER BUILDINGS WILL REMAIN.

THE EXISTING FUEL CANOPY WILL BE REMOVED, THE EXISTING MPD'S (MULTI-PRODUCT DISPENSERS) WILL REMAIN AND THE EXISTING FUEL TANKS WILL REMAIN.
**AUTO FUELING CANOPY - SOUTH ELEVATION**

**SIGNAGE CALCULATION**

**CANOPY SIGNS**
- GRAND TOTAL = 3.7 + 39.0 + 26 = 68.7 SQ. FT.

**MONUMENT SIGN**
- GRAND TOTAL = 3.7 + 39.0 + 26 = 68.7 SQ. FT.

**BUILDING SIGN**
- GRAND TOTAL = 3.7 + 39.0 + 26 = 68.7 SQ. FT.

**GRAND TOTAL = 68.7 SQ. FT.**

**VARIEC FOR 18.7 S.F.**

**AUTO FUELING CANOPY - WEST ELEVATION**
Item 5 A.

G.C. NOTE

5. Prior to pouring foundations place call underground facilities and notify owner. Verify foundation elevation and bearing plate dimensions.

6. Keep all anchor bolt center plates to be at the same elevation, see foundation drawings for the elevation.

DO NOT USE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FOUNDATION UNLESS SIGNED BELOW

[Signature]

CALCRAFT

[Company Logo]

[Address]

[Phone Number]
City of Capitola
Variance Application Form

Variance Summary
Please explain your Variance request and the development standard(s) which you would like to modify.

We are asking that we are allowed to exceed the number of signs allowed by the current code.

We are also asking that we are allowed to exceed the maximum allowable signage area.

Required Findings
Please provide the reasons you believe the following findings can be made to support your Variance request. Note any special circumstances related to your property, including lot size, dimensions, shape, structure, topography, and/or a historic structure. Attach additional pages as necessary.

A. There are unique circumstances applicable to the subject property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

Our primary reason for requesting these variances, is that AJ's Market is essentially operating as three separate businesses. We have a food mart, gas station and a car wash, each requiring its own signage. We as a gas station operator are required by law to display gas prices on the street which requires signage. As a branded gas station with Chevron we are also required to have their logo on our canopy. Our Food Mart sign, is not slated to change and is an important individual part of our business that requires its own signage. Our car wash is also a separate entity which requires an additional sign.

We also feel that our location functions as a corner location to the highway and signage is an important draw to meeting the needs of our customers not from our area.

B. The strict application of the zoning code requirements would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

In reviewing other businesses in the area that are similar to ours, we find that our requests are consistent with the signage that they are allowed to currently have displayed.
C. The variance is necessary to preserve a substantial property right possessed by other property in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

As state above, we feel that our business signage requests are consistent with other businesses in the area.

D. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or be injurious to the property or improvements in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

No.

E. The variance does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity or in the same zone as the subject property.

No.

F. The variance will not have adverse impacts on coastal resources.

No. We are located outside the coastal zone.
Design Permit Design Review Criteria

17.120.070 Design review criteria. When considering design permit applications, the city shall evaluate applications to ensure that they satisfy the following criteria, comply with the development standards of the zoning district, conform to policies of the general plan, the local coastal program, and any applicable specific plan, and are consistent with any other policies or guidelines the city council may adopt for this purpose. To obtain design permit approval, projects must satisfy these criteria to the extent they apply.

A. Community Character. The overall project design including site plan, height, massing, architectural style, materials, and landscaping contribute to Capitola’s unique coastal village character and distinctive sense of place.

B. Neighborhood Compatibility. The project is designed to respect and complement adjacent properties. The project height, massing, and intensity is compatible with the scale of nearby buildings. The project design incorporates measures to minimize traffic, parking, noise, and odor impacts on nearby residential properties.

C. Historic Character. Renovations and additions respect and preserve existing historic structure. New structures and additions to non-historic structures reflect and complement the historic character of nearby properties and the community at large.

D. Sustainability. The project supports natural resource protection and environmental sustainability through features such as on-site renewable energy generation, passive solar design, enhanced energy efficiency, water conservation measures, and other green building techniques.

E. Pedestrian Environment. The primary entrances are oriented towards and visible from the street to support an active public realm and an inviting pedestrian environment.

F. Privacy. The orientation and location of buildings, entrances, windows, doors, decks, and other building features minimizes privacy impacts on adjacent properties and provides adequate privacy for project occupants.

G. Safety. The project promotes public safety and minimizes opportunities for crime through design features such as property access controls (e.g., placement of entrances, fences), increased visibility and features that promote a sense of ownership of outdoor space.

H. Massing and Scale. The massing and scale of buildings complement and respect neighboring structures and correspond to the scale of the human form. Large volumes are divided into small components through varying wall planes, heights, and setbacks. Building placement and massing avoids impacts to public views and solar access.

I. Architectural Style. Buildings feature an architectural style that is compatible with the surrounding built and natural environment, is an authentic implementation of appropriate established architectural styles, and reflects Capitola’s unique coastal village character.

J. Articulation and Visual Interest. Building facades are well articulated to add visual interest, distinctiveness, and human scale. Building elements such as roofs, doors, windows, and
porches are part of an integrated design and relate to the human scale. Architectural details such as trim, eaves, window boxes, and brackets contribute to the visual interest of the building.

K. Materials. Building facades include a mix of natural, high quality, and durable materials that are appropriate to the architectural style, enhance building articulation, and are compatible with surrounding development.

L. Parking and Access. Parking areas are located and designed to minimize visual impacts and maintain Capitola’s distinctive neighborhoods and pedestrian-friendly environment. Safe and convenient connections are provided for pedestrians and bicyclists.

M. Landscaping. Landscaping is an integral part of the overall project design, is appropriate to the site and structures, and enhances the surrounding area.

N. Drainage. The site plan is designed to maximize efficiency of on-site drainage with runoff directed towards permeable surface areas and engineered retention.

O. Open Space and Public Places. Single-family dwellings feature inviting front yards that enhance Capitola’s distinctive neighborhoods. Multifamily residential projects include public and private open space that is attractive, accessible, and functional. Nonresidential development provides semi-public outdoor spaces, such as plazas and courtyards, which help support pedestrian activity within an active and engaging public realm.

P. Signs. The number, location, size, and design of signs complement the project design and are compatible with the surrounding context.

Q. Lighting. Exterior lighting is an integral part of the project design with light fixtures designed, located, and positioned to minimize illumination of the sky and adjacent properties.

R. Accessory Structures. The design of detached garages, sheds, fences, walls, and other accessory structures relates to the primary structure and is compatible with adjacent properties.

S. Mechanical Equipment, Trash Receptacles, and Utilities. Mechanical equipment, trash receptacles, and utilities are contained within architectural enclosures or fencing, sited in unobtrusive locations, and/or screened by landscaping.