



**MARKLEEVILLE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
COUNTY OF ALPINE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Meeting Agenda
99 Water Street, Markleeville – Finance Conference Room
Thursday June 27, 2024
1:00 P.M.**

Markleeville Design Review Committee

Tom Sweeney, Chair
Richard Harvey, Vice-Chair
Marie Bravo
Kathleen Andrews
Wanda Super
Rita Lovell, Ex-Officio

Members of the public who wish to make a general public comment for items not on the day's agenda may submit their comment via email, preferably limited to 250 words or less, to Community Development Planning Staff planning@alpinecountyca.gov. The Markleeville Design Review Committee date and "general comment" should be indicated in the subject line. The comment will be placed in the record for the meeting, and every effort will be made to read the comment into the record at the appropriate time on the agenda.

Every reasonable effort will be made to accommodate any person needing special assistance to participate in this meeting. Please contact the Community Development Planning Staff at 530-694-2140 or at planning@alpinecountyca.gov in advance of the meeting.

The Markleeville Design Review Committee welcomes you to its meetings, which are regularly scheduled for the last Thursday of each month. Your participation and interest are encouraged and appreciated. All members of the public are encouraged to participate in the discussion on any items on the agenda at the time the items come up for Commission consideration. Speakers are requested to identify themselves before speaking. Whenever possible, lengthy testimony should be presented to the Commission in writing and only pertinent points presented.

1. Call to Order

2. General Public Comment

Any person may make comments during the General Public Comment period on items of interest, within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee, that are not listed on the posted agenda. In accordance with the Brown Act, the Committee cannot deliberate or vote on any matter under general public comment.

3. Markleeville Design Review Committee Minutes

3.1. Requested Action/Proposed Motion: Pass a motion to approve the May 14, 2024 meeting minutes.

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Encroachment permit for new driveway -51 Montgomery St. Markleeville, CA
Request for approval of an encroachment permit for a proposed driveway access onto the north side of Montgomery Street including work that may require removal of an existing fence or wall. The property is owned by Kevin and Dillon Mclaughlin and located west of 51 Montgomery Street, Markleeville, CA. APN: 002-270-018-000. Responsible Staff Person: Sam Booth

6. OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion and presentation from staff regarding nonconforming lighting and signage within the Markleeville Historic District.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee will adjourn to the next regular meeting with the meeting date, time, and location to be determined.

All decisions made by the Markleeville Design Review Committee may be appealed to the Alpine County Planning Commission in accordance with Alpine County Code Sections 18.56 and 18.88.



UNAPPROVED – SUBJECT TO CORRECTION

**MARKLEEVILLE DESIGN REVIEW HISTORIC COMMITTEE
COUNTY OF ALPINE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

MINUTES

Thursday, May 14, 2024

1. Call to Order

Chair Tom Sweeney called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. with Members Marie Bravo, and Richard Harvey

A quorum was established.

Staff Present:

Sam Booth, Director

Sarah Traiman, Planner II

Alexa Burke, Planner II

2. General Public Comment

None

3. MINUTES

3.1. Request approval of regular meeting minutes of September 22, 2022

Chair Tom Sweeny moved to approve the minutes of September 22, 2022. The motion was seconded and approved by Members Richard Harvey and Marie Bravo. Motion carried.

4. Unfinished Business

None

5. New Business

5.1 - J. Markleeville Toll Station Re-roof, 14856 Hwy 89, Markleeville

Request by owner Sep Hines to replace the shingles on the roof of the building.

Requested Action/Proposed Motion: Pass a motion finding the project is consistent with County Code Chapter 18.56 and the Markleeville Design Guidelines.

Responsible Staff Person: Sam Booth

Sam Booth introduces the item to the committee. The owner would like to replace the shingles on the building and has a building permit. Charcoal 3-tab dimensional shingles. Staff have already approved the removal of the old roof and water proofing to be put on roof. The owner is waiting for approval of the shingles to replace the roof. Mr. Booth provides the committee with a sample of the proposed shingle material. Staff feels that new shingles meet standards and recommends approval. Sam Booth

opens the comment for the committee and introduces the owner of the Toll Station and applicant, Sep Hines.

Richard Harvey asks what the color of the old roof was. Ms. Hines responds that it was light brown.

Richard Harvey asks about the longevity of the proposed shingles. Ms. Hines responds the roofing material should last 20 years.

Marie Bravo asked about other exterior design changes that should be discussed. Sep Hines states that the only thing proposed for today's meeting is the roof material. Mr. Booth states that staff is planning a meeting with the applicant to walk the property and discuss what other items must be brought to Markleeville Design Review.

Marie Bravo asks what the applicants plans are for outdoor lighting. Ms. Hines states that at this time they do not have a plan. Ms. Bravo states that outdoor lighting on the building must conform to the guidelines and continues to ask Ms. Hines about the sign out front of the restaurant. Ms. Bravo states that the current sign lighting is not in conformance with the guidelines. Mr. Booth confirms that staff will review all proposed materials for the building to ensure that they appropriate and brought to the committee for approval.

Mr. Sweeny asked if there were any other staff findings. Sam Booth responds there are no more staff findings.

Richard Harvey asked if the applicant is planning on putting solar panel on the roof. Owner stated no.

Richard Harvey made a motion to approve roofing material as presented in charcoal tone. Marie Bravo seconds motion with stipulation that all outdoor improvements are first brought before the committee for approval. Tom calls for vote. All in favor.

Sam Booth confirms 3-0 approval.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

Member Marie Bravo: Discussion regarding nonconforming lighting within the Markleeville Historic Area.

Member Marie Bravo described concerns with lighting at various businesses and county buildings in Markleeville. She mentioned that she felt some lighting installed was not compliant with the Markleeville Design Guidelines and was causing too much light pollution in town.

Sam Booth mentioned that it can be hard for staff to know when new lighting is installed if it did not require a building permit or occurred prior to the current staff working for the county. He asked the members for specific examples that they were aware of.

Tom Sweeney asked if county staff could perform a study of light pollution in town. Sam Booth responded that while that might be difficult to do, outreach to businesses notifying them of the standards and best practices could be a good way to encourage compliance.

Richard Harvey questioned why lights needed to be on after businesses were closed.

Tom Sweeney mentioned that he was surprised at how bright the lighting is in town at night. He requested that staff take the comments into consideration and go out to investigate non-compliance issues.

Richard Harvey mentioned that he believed there were also one or more signs around town that didn't meet the requirements on size.

Sam Booth responded that staff would start the process to look into the issue and report back to the committee.

7. Adjournment

The Commission adjourned to the next regular meeting with the meeting date, time and location to be determined.

Tom Sweeney, Chair

Attest:

Samuel R. Booth, AICP
Alpine County Community Development

STAFF REPORT

May 14, 2024

TO: Markleeville Design Review Committee

FROM: Sam Booth, Director

DATE: June 27, 2024

SUBJECT: **51 Montgomery St. Markleeville** – Request for determination of consistency with County Code 18.56 and Markleeville Historic District Guidelines for applicant to construct a new driveway, including work that may require removal of an existing fence or wall.

RECOMMENDATION

Finding that the project is consistent with County Code 18.56 and Markleeville Historic Design Guidelines

SITUATION

A. Applicant:
Kevin McLaughlin

B. Background
Location: 51 Montgomery St
Markleeville, CA, 96120
General Plan Designation: Planned Development-PD
Zoning: Planned Development- PD

C. Project description

The project is to construct a new driveway with encroachment onto the North side of Montgomery St. The proposed driveway location is adjacent to an existing garage and would provide secondary access to Mr. McLaughlin’s residence. The applicant is proposing a stone/gravel driveway and requesting approval to remove the remaining portion of an existing fence/wall in the area. The fence/wall looks to be the remaining portion of a stone fence/wall that was on the site but has deteriorated over time. Today there is less than twelve inches of a stone base left, but further east on Montgomery Street from this location a more substantial portion of the fence is intact and contains metal poles crossed between stone posts. The site is located within the “Residential Treatment Areas” within the Markleeville Design Guidelines “Exhibit A – Treatment Areas Map”.

D. Committee Determination

Section 18.56.090 E of the Alpine County Code requires the Design Review Committee to determine if projects comply with the zoning code and the Design Guidelines:

Upon the completion of its review, the committee shall determine whether or not the proposed activity complies with the requirements of this chapter and is consistent with the Markleeville design guidelines approved by the board of supervisors. The determination may include conditions of approval necessary to make the activity comply with the requirements of this chapter and the Markleeville design guidelines. If the determination is that the activity does not comply with the requirements of this chapter and/or the Markleeville design guidelines, the committee shall state the specific reasons and provide the same in writing to the applicant within three working days of the determination.

E. Staff findings

The Markleeville Design Guidelines contain standards for Residential Treatment Areas which states:

Design Guidelines for Residential Treatment Areas

These guidelines apply to all residentially zoned properties in the Townsite, including those on Laramie and Montgomery Streets, and those in newer developing residential areas. Due to the nature of residential development, the guidelines are not detailed to the extent of the Commercial Core guidelines. While alterations to historic residences (built before 1940) should be more restricted, most of the guidelines relate to Markleeville's traditional, small town atmosphere rather than historic architecture. The guidelines are intended to provide direction to property owners on how to protect and enhance Markleeville's neighborhoods. They are not intended to restrict what an individual may legally do with property development, but to provide guidance as to what the community values.

The guidelines focus on garages, parking, outdoor lighting, fences, walls, and front porches. They give some suggestions regarding mass and scale.

The Markleeville Design Guidelines contain standards for driveways within section F.1.c. which states:

c. Driveways. *Minimize the impact the driveway will have on the street scene as follows:*

- i. Minimize the width of the driveway*
- ii. Consider materials other than black top and asphalt*
- iii. Consider providing ribbon strips of paving*
- iv. Materials that are not impervious and reduce run off are preferred*

The Markleeville Design Guidelines contain standards for walls and fences within section F.4. which states:

Traditionally, front fences are simple, wood picket. They are low in height and have a transparent feel. They allowed views out of and into yards. Rock walls are popular and some have historic significance. They use natural stone an have a hand built appearance. They are fairly low to the ground, providing views over them.

Staff Response: The applicant is proposing to install a twelve foot wide unpaved driveway, which seems to be consistent with the design guideline language to “minimize the width of the driveway” and to “consider paving materials other than black top or asphalt”. Additionally, while the remaining portion of the fence/wall has a hand built stone appearance which could have historical significance, it is less than twelve inches in height (less than six inches in some areas) and the majority of it has deteriorated or been previously removed. Therefore, the removal of it in this area would not seem to have a significant impact. Furthermore, the Design Guidelines mention that in residential areas the guidelines are “not intended to restrict what an individual may legally do with property development, but to provide guidance as to what the community values” and the applicant here is applying to construct a driveway to get access to his parcel.

ALTERNATE ACTIONS

1. Find that the project is not consistent with either the ordinance or Design Guidelines with specific findings.
2. Continue the meeting pending consideration of additional information necessary to make a decision.

RECOMMENDATION

Find that the project is consistent with County Code 18.56 and the Markleeville design guidelines.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam Booth, Director



Property Line

Proposed
Unpaved
Access

Montgomery St

33'

12'

150'

105'

Parcel 002270018

