

**CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 9, 2013**

Subcommittee Members Present: Julia Darden and Bart Crandell

Staff Present: Jim Pechous, Cliff Jones and Amber Gregg

I. MINUTES

Minutes from the December 12, 2012 meeting

II. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

A. Minor Cultural Heritage Permit 12-322, Miller Mixed-Use Remodel (Gregg)

DRSC's second review for a request to consider a façade remodel of a five-unit apartment complex located at 122 Avenida Victoria. The applicant is also proposing to enclose a 116 square foot breezeway of the 5,068 square foot structure. The project is located within the Mixed Use zoning district and the Central Business District and Architectural Overlays (MU3-CA-A). The legal description is Lots 27 and 28 of Block 7, of Tract 779, and Assessor's Parcel Number 058-083-39.

The applicant stated that they felt frustrated with the discretionary process and were confused about what Spanish Colonial Revival style vernacular the City was looking for. Commissioner Darden stated that she was sorry that they were feeling frustrated but that the revised design they submitted was very good and that the goal was to move them forward in the process. Ms. Darden also requested they provide their experience in writing so staff could review any shortcomings and modify them for future applicants.

Associate Planner, Amber Gregg, provided a brief summary of the previous DRSC review and went over how the applicant addressed the Committee's seven concerns.

1. The applicant removed the surrounds from the windows and proposed to inset the windows 1 7/8 inches with a bull nose finish to give a traditional look. The applicant requested that the side windows that are not visible not be required to have the 1 7/8 inch inset because the framing does not permit it. DRSC stated they supported the request.

2. The applicant modified the parapets so the roof can not be seen when viewing the building, and modified the parapets so they do not look like plant on features.
3. The window openings were oriented to vertical windows where feasible but the applicant maintained the lintels above the windows. The Subcommittee members stated that the lintels could be added or deleted; it was the applicant's choice, but that they added a lot of character to the front lower windows.
4. The applicant modified the exterior finish from a cats paw to a smooth stucco.
5. The applicant modified the light fixtures from craftsman to a traditional Spanish fixture.
6. The window material was not identified on the plans. The applicant noted the intent was to have wood on the front but they would like to utilize fiberglass on the remainder of the building. The Subcommittee members reviewed the window policy for the Architectural Overlay District and stated that the fiberglass windows would be great as long as all the windows had the same color finish. They also informed the applicant that the Planning Commission will be reviewing the window policy at an upcoming meeting and that if the policy changes to allow fiberglass windows on the ground floor of buildings windows visible from the public right-of-way, they would concur that their recommendation for wood windows be automatically changed to utilize fiberglass on the front elevation. Staff stated that they would make the applicant aware if the Planning Commission revises their interpretation of the window policy. Further the DRSC is a recommending body to the Zoning Administrator who will make the final decision on the window material.
7. The applicant and the DRSC reviewed the symmetry of the front elevation and the property owner agreed that the true arch was a much better look on the building than the segmented arch.

With the submittal of the revised plans, staff had a concern about the lack of symmetry on the bulking and the effects it had on the aesthetics. The applicant stated that she had brought revised drawings with her that added an additional window to help address the concerns. Although the revision looked better on the outside it did not work on the inside of the unit because of the odd placement in the floor plan making furniture arrangement inside very difficult. Commissioner Crandell reviewed the floor plan and concurred that the placement was not ideal with the floor plan. The DRSC and the applicant reviewed the plans and came up with a resolution that worked with the applicant that modified the roof line back to the original design but kept the window design of the resubmitted plans. The applicant was happy with the resolution.

Staff reviewed all the modifications and summarized the discussion. Staff also noted that the project did not need to return to DRSC and that after the meeting Ms. Gregg

would review the public hearing schedule to assure the project is scheduled for the next available public hearing.

III. COMMUNICATIONS

None

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to the Design Review Subcommittee meeting of January 23, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in Conference Room A, Community Development Department, 910 Calle Negocio, Suite 100, San Clemente, CA 92673.

Respectfully submitted,



Julia Darden, Vice Chair

Attest:



Cliff Jones