

**CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 13, 2013**

Subcommittee Members Present: Michael Kaupp, Julia Darden and Bart Crandell

Staff Present: Jim Pechous, Cliff Jones, Amber Gregg, Adam Atamian and  
John Ciampa

**1. MINUTES**

Minutes approved: October 23, 2013

**2. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS**

**A. Amendment to Site Plan Permit 02-093/Architectural Permit 13-360,  
Carillon Homes in Talega, Tract 16336 (Gregg)**

Subcommittee Member Crandell recused himself noting that Standard Pacific is a client of his.

A request to consider revised architecture for the last 17 lots of an 84 lot development in the Talega Specific Plan area.

Amber Gregg, Associate Planner summarized the staff report. Staff commended the applicant for having the community meeting and modifying the plans to help address some of the residents' concerns prior to DRSC. However, staff indicated they still have some concerns about the front elevations on several of the proposed designs as summarized below:

**General Comments**

Carillon originally had architectural details which are not present on the proposed plans, decorative chimney caps, wrought iron railings as opposed to tubular steel, decorative lighting, and various garage door style options; single and double doors. In addition the plans do not have callouts identifying materials, which needs to be provided. The applicant stated that they would look into the designs and incorporate the comments as much as they could.

Staff then went over each design elevation:

### Monterey

All the approved Monterey Homes have covered usable, wood balconies off the front elevation. Only one of the proposed elevations has a usable balcony, a second has a Juliette balcony and the third has no balcony at all. The approved plans have less decorative brick or stone veneer and do not provide details such as thick molding around windows and doors. Removal of the balconies and the addition of the veneer change the feel of the Monterey architecture to more of a traditional architecture.

Subcommittee Members Darden and Kaupp both stated that removing the usable decks was a big change to the design that did impact the appearance as well as take away from the Monterey Style.

### Tuscan

The approved Tuscan homes have a mix of architectural details including small vertical, recessed, arched windows with enhanced framing, thick framed front entries, pop-outs treated with decorative wood, and Juliette balconies. The proposed design incorporates the same veneer style and two of the three designs have Juliette balconies. There are no arched windows, wood pop-outs or enhanced framing. Staff believes these details should be included in the new designs. These details give Carillon its distinctive architectural character.

### Spanish

The original Spanish style was identified as Spanish Colonial Revival; the proposed style is simply identified as Spanish. Like the previous two styles the original plans all had a balcony or a Juliette balcony. Only one of the proposed designs has a balcony and it's a Juliette. The applicant did incorporate some details from the previous plans, such as decorative wrought iron window coverings along the front sidewalk and gable roof elements. The difference between the two designs is that the original approved plans had various roof lines that incorporated gable and shed roof elements. The proposed designs don't have shed roofs which make all three designs look similar. Staff suggested adding a shed roof with a usable balcony for a more compatible look.

It is not clear if the proposed Spanish will feature smooth white stucco or light sand finished. Staff would recommend the finish be the same as the existing homes. The Subcommittee Members agreed that it should be consistent.

Staff concluded their presentation and Subcommittee Member Kaupp invited public comment.

Ms. Rachel Strugila, resident of 19 Via Franca, provided a letter with pictures to the Committee Members, staff and the applicant. Ms. Strugila stated she was concerned about the balconies and that the new product did not have chimneys. She also stated that there were not side architectural details and the Carillon product had details such as pop outs and shutters. She requested that the same roof tiles be used and that a mix of plans and architecture be used on the street. She noted that she wanted Standard Pacific to finish the tract with the quality product that there started with.

Subcommittee Members Darden and Kaupp stated that they like the proposed floor plans of the home but concurred with staff that more character defining architectural details of Carillon need to be incorporated into the new product. They asked that Carillon revise the plans and have another community meeting prior to returning to DRSC. The Subcommittee also noted that five sided architecture is very important and should be incorporated into the plans as well.

**B. Minor Cultural Heritage Permit 13-343, Proctor Residence Deck Addition (Atamian)**

A request to consider a deck addition in the rear portion of a coastal canyon lot, abutting a historic property, located at 226 Trafalgar Lane within the Residential Low Density (Coastal Zone) zoning district.

Assistant Planner Adam Atamian summarized the staff report. Mr. Atamian stated that the applicant has revised the proposed deck addition to reduce visual impacts to the historic property. Mr. Atamian distributed a plan revision sheet to the DRSC, and explained that the deck project no longer includes extending the existing deck further toward the canyon.

Subcommittee Member Darden stated that projects located on Coastal Canyon lots should consider not just the streetscape view, but also the view presented to properties located on opposite sides of the canyon. She stated that she agrees with staff's concern regarding the angled support columns, and noted that the impact to the historic property is more than just based on visibility from within the historic structure.

Subcommittee Member Crandell stated that he is pleased to see the reduction of the deck in the area closest to the historic structure. He asked the applicant why the project proposed angled support brackets that utilized existing footings.

Stuart Proctor, the applicant, stated that the engineering report indicated that the existing footings were sufficient to support the additional load of the deck addition, and that by using the footings with the angled supports the integrity of the canyon would be maintained.

Jack Garland, the architect for the project, reiterated Mr. Proctor's point about the sufficiency of the existing footings, stating that new footings would be a major engineering project involving the drilling of caissons up to 50 feet into the ground near the canyon edge. Mr. Garland noted that the angled support would not be very visible from the historic property.

Mr. Proctor noted that the elevation of the deck steps down toward the south, and thus will be out of the line of sight of the historic property.

Subcommittee Member Kaupp asked Mr. Garland how many angled supports are proposed. Mr. Garland replied that three supports are proposed, two toward the canyon and one toward the south.

Subcommittee Member Kaupp asked if the angled supports could be wrapped in a boxed frame that visually appeared similar to the existing columns. Mr. Garland stated that there is a patio below the proposed deck addition and to box out the angled supports would cut-off access to the patio.

Subcommittee Member Crandell asked if the DRSC is to review this project for anything more than whether the project will have a negative visual impact to the historic structure. Mr. Atamian stated that the project must comply with the Design Guidelines, however, in this case there are none that dictate a specific architectural style, so ultimately, and the DRSC is reviewing this project for whether there is a negative visual impact.

Rich, the owner of the historic property, stated that Mr. Proctor is very considerate in sharing his plans with him. He stated that he is very happy with the proposed plan. He is very appreciative of having a good neighbor who does what he says he is going to do.

Subcommittee Member Darden stated that typically the view from within the historic property is not taken into consideration, and that the revision to the deck to maintain the historic property's ocean view is nice.

Rich, the historic property owner, stated that he was not notified of the public hearing. Mr. Atamian stated that this was not a public hearing, but that for the Zoning Administrator meeting to follow, he will be notified.

The DRSC indicated that the project complies with City Design Guidelines, indicated the project will have very minor visual impacts to the historic property, and the angled support columns should be wrapped to architecturally tie them into the rest of the building.

**C. Historic Property Preservation Agreement 13-384, Peat Residence  
(Ciampa)**

A request to consider a Mills Act agreement for a historic house located at 115 East Avenida Canada.

Associate Planner John Ciampa summarized the staff report.

The DRSC was in support of the proposed Mills Act and recommended the following restoration improvements in addition to the staff recommendations:

- The interlocking pavers are not a historically accurate material and they should be modified to concrete, pavers or another traditional material. The hardscape in front of the garage should line up with the garage.
- The building is a cream color that is not the traditional Ole Hanson white color and should be white.
- More landscaping should be added to the front of the property to improve the stark design.
- The light fixture at the front of the property should be replaced with a light fixture that is in scale with the building.

**D. Historic Property Preservation Agreement 13-136, Pagan Residence  
(Ciampa)**

A request to consider a Mills Act agreement for a historic house located at 109 West Avenida Cadiz.

Associate Planner John Ciampa summarized the staff report.

The DRSC was in support of the staff recommended Mills Act improvements and requested staff to evaluate the yellow/orange tile around the windows to see if it should be added to the improvement list. If staff determines the tile is not a traditional Spanish Colonial Revival feature then the DRSC recommends removal of the tile be added to the list.

**E. Conditional Use Permit 13-249/Architectural Permit 13-251/Site Plan Permit 13-252, La Ventura Event Center (Gregg)**

A request to consider a new two-story commercial building for a special event center totaling 9,293 square feet at 2316 South El Camino Real.

Associate Planner Amber Gregg summarized the staff report and went over staff's recommendations. After, the applicant, Don Kappauf, and his architect Gray Wiggle, stated that they have modifications that they would like to present to the Subcommittee that they believe will address staff's concerns. The Subcommittee asked that he present the modifications.

The applicant's architect went over modifications to every elevation.

Front elevation (wall)

Applicant added inset arches with decorative tile in the inset. Applicant stated that they will also incorporate revised landscaping to add extra interest and appeal to the streetscape. DRSC liked the modification and discussed appropriate signage locations on the building. Subcommittee Member Kaupp informed the applicant of tile murals that had event scenes. The applicant was very receptive to this idea and thought it would tie in nicely with the project. Lighting of the murals was also discussed.

North Elevation (Property Line Wall)

The applicant did not modify the courtyard wall but did enhance the first half of the two-story building. The applicant added inset arches and framed details to help break up the vast area. The applicant stated that expansion joints would be needed on the building. The Subcommittee discussed previous use of expansion joints and stated that the joints would have to be architecturally placed and hidden by landscaping. Subcommittee Member Kaupp suggested using Italian Cypress because of its lines and height.

The applicant stated that the next door neighbor at San O Tires has given permission to the applicant to add planting on his side. The Subcommittee stated that was great but that a landscape easement would be required to ensure that the landscaping would be provided.

The applicant also requested a light sand finish stucco. City Planner, Jim Pechous suggested the applicant look at the stucco on the Casa Romantica. The architect and the applicant were familiar with the building and stated that finish would work for their project. The Subcommittee expressed support of the finish.

The applicant then went through the remaining elevations and discussed details and anticipated operation of the project.

Subcommittee Member Kaupp appreciated the applicant coming prepared with good solutions to staff's concerns. He also noted that there is some level of precedence on expansion joints.

Subcommittee Member Crandell also commended the applicant and noted that the project is outside of the Architectural Overlay and the applicants still chose to do Spanish architecture. He noted that the City places a lot of requirements on applicants to comply with Spanish Colonial Architecture and was concerned that because of that, the City may be discouraging applicants from using the Spanish Colonial Revival preferred style. He noted that he was fine with the Casa stucco finish and the use of strategically placed control joints because of the cracking concerns.

Subcommittee Member Darden also supported the proposed changes and stated that architectural treatment on all four sides of the project is important.

The Subcommittee noted that the applicant did not need to return to DRSC.

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

None

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourn to the Regular Meeting of the Design Review Subcommittee to be held November 27, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. in Conference Room A, Community Development Department, 910 Calle Negocio, Suite 100, San Clemente, CA 92673.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Kaupp, Chair

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Cliff Jones, Associate Planner